



Local Community Responses to the Commodification of Livelihoods in Tourism Destination of Borobudur

Janianton Damanik^{1*}, M. Baiquni¹, Yusuf Hermawan¹, Petrus Jilbert Millians Pulla¹

¹Universitas Gadjah Mada, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received February 03, 2024

Revised July 15, 2024

Accepted July 22, 2024

Available online August 31, 2024

Keywords:

Response; Local Community; Commodification; Livelihood; Borobudur Destination



This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license. Copyright © 2024 by Author. Published by Universitas Pendidikan Ganesha.

ABSTRACT

The commodification of local community livelihoods occurs in many tourism destinations. How community responds to this does not seem to have been discussed much in previous researches. This paper aims to explore the response of local communities to the increasing practice of commodifying livelihoods in the super priority destination Borobudur based on their three socio-economic variables, namely: social position, education and the volume of assets owned. A survey method has been chosen to collect main data which is analysed using inferential statistics. It was found that the commodification of livelihood assets occurred intensively due to the development of tourism in these destinations. It has been proven that the commodification of livelihoods has been responded differently by local communities. The differences in responses are clearly shown by socio-economic background. Those with higher education are more responsive in the sense of agreeing with commodification compared to those with low education. Apart from that, the social position also influences different responses to the commodification of livelihoods

in the tourism destination. Likewise, the volume of assets owned also differentiates their response to the commodification of livelihoods. From these findings it was concluded that the response to the commodification of livelihoods related to the development of tourism destinations was responded differently by local communities. The implication is that destination development needs to pay attention to preserving the livelihoods of local communities as one of the strengths of attraction.

1. INTRODUCTION

The Borobudur area has been designated by the government as one of five super priority tourism destinations. The development of various physical infrastructure to support accessibility (airports), amenities (restaurants, camping grounds), and accommodation (hotels) is carried out intensively by utilizing built-up areas and empty land (BPIW-Ministry of PUPR, 2020). The number of tourists has indeed decreased due to COVID-19, namely from 3.990 million in 2019 to 0.997 million in 2020, then increasing slightly to 1.497 million people in 2022 (BPS Magelang Regency, 2024). Infrastructure improvements and tourism recovery after the pandemic are predicted to have a significant impact on tourism development in the region.

The community's response to the effects of infrastructure development, especially the increasing commodification of livelihoods, has not been explored in depth and therefore it is necessary to carry out appropriate mitigation for the subsequent impacts on sustainable livelihoods in that tourism destination. The analysis is also relatively limited to the form of community response to tourism development and ignores the possibility of differences in responses made by local residents. This study will fill this gap.

In general, the development of tourism destination is strongly associated with the commodification of local cultural resources and place (Young and Markham (2020). Building infrastructure, revitalizing land, increasing economic and non-economic production and community livelihoods are an inseparable part of the destination development plan, namely pushing tourism destinations into attractive economic markets (Chen and Kong, 2021). Increased investment encourages infrastructure extension, starting from adding road sections and networks, converting land into tourism facilities, modifying and revitalizing buildings, as well as reactivating cultural events to attract tourists. All of these processes can be seen as commodification of the local livelihood.

*Corresponding author

E-mail addresses: antondmk@ugm.ac.id

In destination development, the main purpose of the resources commodification is to increase economic values (Chen and Kong, 2021). Commodification is a method taken to create added value for resources consumed by tourists and partly by local community. For example, the volume of infrastructure needs to increase in quantity, as well as the quality needs to be improved to increase user comfort. This added value attracts tourists to visit the destination and consume the products and services that become the attractions at the destination.

However, the commodification of these resources often extends to the livelihood assets of people in destinations. Commodification is accompanied by a transfer of value for resources from producer to user. In this way its form is a reduction in the meaning of a community asset, namely from the combination of economic, social and cultural meanings to only economic meaning. This phenomenon happens, as commodification also replaces the initial and basic functions attached to the commodified assets.

Some experts justified that people's livelihoods are often used as tourism commodities (Bai and Weng, 2023; Chen and Kong, 2021; Eslami et al, 2019). However, this commodification of livelihoods does not automatically have an even positive impact on local communities. Nurhadi et al. (2022), for example, found out that tourism development paid less attention to ethical aspects which then exploited the traditions of the Osing Tribe in Banyuwangi. Study by Mokgachane et al. (2021) discovered the impact of tourism on the commodification of local music in Botswana, Africa. In China, Bai and Weng (2023) found that commodification of layers of artifacts and community behavior patterns in the sacrificial ceremony of Genghis Khan occurred in a subtle way and the layers of institutional structures and values are remained relatively persistent. Similar things were also found in Southeast Asian countries (Dewayanti and Raafigani, 2016). This impact is predicted to cause insecurity in the livelihoods of people in the destination.

Until now, the assumption that local communities benefit from destination development still becomes a debatable issue by experts (Mak, 2004; Karim, 2008; Salazar, 2012; Alamineh, et al, 2023). The debate concerning the facts about tourism contribution or impact on local communities. On the one hand, tourism has a positive impact on expanding employment opportunities and regional income (Mak, 2004). On the other hand, this view is contrary to other facts, because the development of tourism destinations results in the marginalization of local residents (Karim, 2004), the undermine of local culture (Alamineh et al, 2023) as well as social tension and conflict at the grassroots level (Salazar, 2012). Perez (2018), for example, found that the transfer of land ownership in destinations through buying and selling transactions degrades the livelihoods of local communities because with these transactions they are not fully able to enter employment and business opportunities in the tourism sector. Karim (2008) shows that fishing communities have lost their livelihoods due to the commodification of coastal and marine resources on Lombok Island, Indonesia. This means that the transformation of jobs and sustainable livelihoods expected to occur in destination development still need a detailed and critical explanation (Mak, 2004; Gibson, 2009) and needs to be studied more deeply.

However, the previous studies have not fully captured the effects of tourism on sustainable livelihoods in destinations. In particular, the community's response to the commodification of livelihoods in destinations has also received less serious attention from researchers (McGehee and Andereck, 2004). It is generally assumed that destination development is linear with a positive response from local communities (Turner, 2007). This assumption ignores the fact that local communities have significant differences in the ownership of economic capital and social capital (Cornet, 2015). The fundamental capital ownership factor is actually a determinant for the society to respond positively or negatively to changes in the environment and livelihoods (Bires and Raj, 2020).

Nunkoo and So (2016), for example, highlight the community's response to tourism development in general, while Nugroho and Numanta (2022) highlight the community's response to tourism based on perceived benefits and involvement in the various impacts of ecotourism in Mount Ciremai National Park. By considering these reasons, this study aims to fill the gap in scientific analysis by questioning that people respond to the processes of commodification of livelihoods differently in tourism destinations based on their social, demographic and economic characteristics. The questions that will be specifically examined are: a) how do local communities in the Borobudur tourism destination respond to the commodification of livelihoods; b) what factors that cause differences in community responses to the commodification of livelihoods in the Borobudur tourism destination? Hence, this study will contribute to two things, namely: first, providing a theoretical explanation of the different responses of local communities to pressures from the development of tourism destinations due to the commodification of livelihoods; secondly, offering ideas about the importance of conserving local community livelihoods in tourism destinations.

Commodification is defined as an action or process that turns something into a commodity which can then be bought and sold (<https://sociologydictionary.org>). It describes a process that changes something (goods and services) that previously had no economic value into one with economic value that can replace other social values. In this process, the basis for assessing goods or services changes to become commercial

for everyday use (Lavesque, 2016). In the liberal economic system, the transformation of tangible and intangible goods and services into commodities often occurs. Rivers, beaches, landscapes, ideas and personal data are treated as commodities to obtain economic gain and social status.

Studies on commodification in tourism development have been conducted by many previous researchers (Otsuki, 2023; Adveni and Razali, 2022; Lasso and Dahles, 2018). Almost similar to them, Shepherd (2002) explains that the process of cultural commodification easily occurs in tourism destinations because tourists tend to look for new experiences, namely through what is called 'becoming the other'. Experiencing something different from everyday life in a destination is one of the basic travel motives (van Vuuren and Slabbert, 2011). The production of mass services that are able to convey the meaning of 'becoming the other' means that rituals and traditions are commodified for the sake of money and then their social value is destructed. On a more negative side, this degradation of social values appears in the form of prostitution, drug abuse, and the like (Shepherd, 2002).

Spatial commodification has also become the focus of attention of experts in tourism development. Young and Markham (2020), for example, highlight the function of space, which is actually a place to live and carry out routine activities to fulfill the livelihoods of the residents in it, then turns into a tourism destination where other residents are deliberately 'brought in' from outside. The presence of tourists then makes a space, for example a village, not only a place for local residents to settle, but also for traded commodities. Becoming a space that attracts tourists certainly requires capital investment, for example tourism infrastructure and facilities. The accumulation of investment and tourist movements increases the economic value of space and its contents, which may exceed other non-economic values.

Commodification in the context of destination development actually has a double meaning. On the one hand, there are economic benefits for local residents from the resources they own in the form of increased asset value (Wu and Pearce, 2014), but on the other hand they also have the potential to lose access to local resources that have changed function and ownership to other parties (Ana and Naam, 2017). For example, in a number of destinations, the phenomenon of land grabbing often occurs and leaves complex problems socially, culturally and ecologically (Colorni, 2018; Neef, 2019), including loss of local residents' access to shared spaces and a decrease in land physical carrying capacity (Cornet, 2015). McGehee et al. (2004) claim that in rural areas personal factors are less strong in determining support for development, on the contrary, communal factors significantly influence it.

Commodification can also cause homogenization of people's livelihood values. In Mozambique, Otsuki (2023) describes the impact of settlement projects on the homogenization of livelihood values. Through the compensation given to the community, their assets lose their social and cultural meaning and are solely valued as economic commodities. By utilizing this perspective, in this study livelihood commodification is defined as the process of transferring the status and function of livelihood assets (physical, natural, social, cultural and economic assets) that are original to society into the form of tourism products and services. This commodification occurs through the transformation of goods and services that have value attached to their original owner or creator into products that can be purchased and partially used by other parties for purposes different from their original function (Rosenblatt, 2005; Hall, 2022).

One of the important effects of the commodification of space in tourism is privatization. As space becomes an item that can be traded to provide tourism infrastructure and facilities such as hotels, restaurants, airports, ports, terminals, etc., the function of ownership changes. The form that is quite prominent is privatization. This means the process of transferring rights to exclusive legal ownership of land to individuals or groups of people who hold a monopoly while ignoring the rights of other people (Young and Markham, 2020). The example is privatization of beaches by tourism resort businesses with ownership or lease rights; the rights holder has the power to determine who can and cannot visit or use the area.

The development of tourism destinations is marked by processes of commodification and privatization of natural and cultural resources. This occurs as a result of the increasing demand for the resources (which will be commercialized) to provide tourism infrastructure and facilities. Driven by the increasing need for accommodation (as a consequence of tourist market demand), the demand for the construction of accommodation and other supporting facilities increases (Colorni, 2018). Mason (2003) stated that since 1960-1980 land prices in Bali were relatively stable, but along with the development of tourism twenty years later the price of this commodity skyrocketed by up to 150 percent.

The land commodification has a direct impact on the livelihoods of people in the destination. Colorni (2018) describes in detail the negative effects of large-scale land commodification for the sake of real estate development and the tourism industry in just 10 years. These effects directly threaten the livelihoods of farmers. In the 2003-2013 period, Bali recorded a 17% decline in farming families and those involved in some agricultural activities, as well as a 29% decline in the number of subsistence farmers. As a result, more than 13,000 households have stopped growing rice, 55,000 households have stopped planting vegetables,

a 22% decrease in smallholder farming households (owners of between 0.5 – 2 hectares) of land. Currently, the similar tendency occurs in other regions of Indonesia (Kusumawardhani and Giyarsih, 2023).

In the midst of the commodification of limited resources, local communities in destinations face a dilemma. For them, it is not easy to ignore the strong attraction of land commodification. Rapid developments in infrastructure in tourism destinations tend to be followed by increases in prices of other economic commodities, including basic needs (food, water, electricity, etc.). In short, high inflation occurs more often in tourism destinations, especially those visited by foreign tourists (Mason, 2003). This high inflation urges people to review the existence of commodities which are also their source of livelihood.

On the other hand, the attraction of commodification contains the uncertainty of sustainable livelihoods. Commodification which leads to the transfer of land ownership rights cannot guarantee that local communities will enjoy long-term livelihoods, especially in the same destination. Studies in various developing countries prove that land grabbing in tourism tends to marginalize land owners (Neef, 2019). Privatization as a derivative of land commodification is a further step in the alienation of society over land and other natural resources. Once people are marginalized from their land, there is very little chance of them returning to own land with the same status and quality. The view of Balinese farmers represents this picture, as quoted by Colorni (2018), that someone can continue to make money but it is impossible to create (new) land.

The dilemma above raises a theoretical perspective on how a community responds to the commodification of livelihoods in tourism destinations. From this description, the concept of commodification in this study refers to the process of changing the value of people's livelihoods due to the development of tourism destinations. This change is related to an increase in the economic value of assets attached to people's livelihoods. Chambers and Conway (1991) formulate the concept of livelihood as "the capabilities, assets (including both material and social resources) and activities required for a means of living". Capability refers to the ability to perform certain basic functions to change and respond to change. In certain situations a person is challenged to respond appropriately to their external environment in order to ensure a sustainable livelihood. Assets are defined as all valuable savings that are tangible or intangible, such as gifts, skills, capacities that can be used by individuals or institutions to overcome crises in a community (Kretzmann, McKnight, and Sheehan, 1997). Assets also can be understood as capital that are interconnected, cyclical and function as economic production factors to obtain livelihoods for individual entities, households and communities (Sinha et al, 2020).

Activities include all actions to use or manage capabilities and assets for continued livelihoods. In short, these capabilities, assets and activities are not only closely related to each other but are also assumed to be commodified for the needs of developing tourism destinations and determining the sustainability of people's livelihoods.

Studies show that local communities' attitudes and responses to destination development tend to change. These attitudes and responses are related to the development phases that a destination goes through and tend to occur linearly (Nugroho and Numanta, 2021). Specifically, other researchers show that tourism activities aimed at maintaining and conserving natural resources for the livelihood of local communities can be responded positively (Yun and Zhang, 2017). This means that tourism development is responded to by a community if it provides guarantees of sustainable livelihoods.

The process of commodification of livelihoods occurs in the dynamic meeting of the demand side and supply response, namely bargaining among local residents over commodities and between local residents and newcomers, including tourists. Their perceptions of environmental changes, including livelihoods, effects on responses to and support for tourism (Park, Nunkoo, Yoon, 2015). Even though society tends to have uniform norms, other elements of livelihood are more diverse. In terms of capabilities, for example, differences occur both collectively, for example within a household, and individually within the household, and society (Rua, 2020). For example, an elderly and disabled head of household has limited capabilities to respond to external changes, for example residential relocation due to the expansion of tourism facilities, compared to other heads of household who are not disabled.

These differences can be encompassed in the three main elements of livelihood (capabilities, assets and activities). A household does not necessarily have a balanced livelihood in a certain period; conversely, asset ownership may be more limited than the range of activities that can be undertaken. It can also be assumed that people perceive differently the commodification of livelihoods that occurs in destinations based on their socio-demographic characteristics. Support for tourism development also depends on their level of involvement in the sector. Previous studies (Rua, 2020; Delita et al, 2024) show that the level of economic development of communities in rural tourism destinations determines their support for tourism development. As assumed, destination development is full of commodification of livelihoods, so the intensity of commodification also depends on the economic conditions of the local community. In particular, economic activities related to tourism adapt more easily to changes in commodification so that those who

work in those activities are more supportive of tourism development. Furthermore, Nunkoo and Gursoy (2011) and Nugroho and Numanta (2022) explained that the factors of type of work, environmental identity and gender influence support for tourism development. It is stated that the social, economic and ecological characteristics of a community contribute to support for tourism.

Responses to the livelihoods commodification depend on many factors; one of them is a person's role and social status in the society. As a degree of honor or prestige attached to a person's position in society, social status can be used as an important guide for people to use different livelihood strategies (Abbey et al, 2019). Based on this, the first hypothesis can be proposed as follows:

H1: There are no significant differences in community responses to the livelihoods commodification based on social position in the tourism destinations.

A person's knowledge about the value of a sustainable livelihood can be obtained by achieving a certain level of education. However, the level of education often does not contribute positively to the capacity to effectively manage livelihoods due to the absence of providing relevant skills to the tourism economy (Rachmawati et al, 2021). Therefore, the second hypothesis is:

H2: There is no significant difference in community response to the livelihoods commodification based on education in tourism destinations.

Experts claim that livelihood assets have a positive influence on the community livelihood strategies they take (Wijayanto et al, 2019). The accumulation of assets forms a structure of opportunity that allows a person to design a future life (Chowa and Masa, 2013). The livelihoods commodification is thus easily responded to by the community by considering the volume of assets they own. Based on this, the first hypothesis can be proposed as follows:

H3: There is no significant difference in community response to commodification based on the volume of assets owned in tourism destinations.

2. METHOD

This study employs a quantitative approach using survey research. The quantitative approach uses surveys to collect data and information that can be quantified and analyzed using statistical methods to prove assumptions and hypothesis claims (Williams, 2007). Survey research based on the use of structured questionnaires (Cheung, 2021; Harris and Brown, 2019) was applied, as it is easier to find and map variations in community responses to the commodification of livelihoods. Through this approach, explanations and predictions can be found about the interrelationships between various social phenomena (Pozzo, Borgobello, and Pierella, (2019) in tourism destinations, for example changing livelihood conditions and community responses to these changes. Based on these findings, generalizations can be made about phenomena that occur in destination development in other regions.

Candirejo Village, one of 20 tourist villages in the Borobudur Temple area, Magelang Regency, was chosen purposively as the study location. The selection was based on its relatively rapidly developing status, marked by the addition of public infrastructure and tourism (Central Bureau of Statistics of Magelang Regency, 2021). The extension of infrastructure and facilities is closely related to changes in the basic livelihood functions of local communities. All 1,416 households recorded in the village in 2022 are used as the population. The list of names of Heads of Families was obtained from the village office and used as a sampling frame, and the names were recorded as population units (Leavy, 2017; Mantra and Kasto, 2012). Sampling was taken from one husband and wife couple or adult household members with the consideration that both parents were temporarily away and they were able to answer the questions in the questionnaire.

The sample was selected by simple random (Lee and Landers, 2022) using the criteria of homogeneity of population, forecast precision, and analysis plan (Mantra and Kasto, 2012). Total sample was determined at 164 or around 11.5% on the basis that the survey population was relatively homogeneous in terms of type of work (farming and tourism services), were native residents so it was assumed they still had a significant livelihood, and were both centers of prominent tourism destination development. This study tries to generalize with a prediction accuracy rate of 95%.

Structured interviews as the main method in surveys (Neuman, 2016; Sugiyono, 2020) were carried out directly with respondents when they were at home and at community meetings. They were explained the right to protect personal data, the interview plan, duration, and the data collected, such as: asset ownership, response to the asset 'touristification' processes, land buying and selling transactions, and so on. The respondents were provided with the option of being able to fill in the questionnaire themselves or the researcher to help fill it in according to the answer choices desired by the respondent. Two assistants did this for 14 days.

Apart from that, non-participatory observation was also carried out to collect the necessary data without involving second or third parties (Neuman, 2016). Observation can broaden insight into the subject of study and researchers need to involve themselves in it to gain a better understanding and a more holistic

perspective (Eldh et al, 2020). Data consists of signs or evidence of community response to the commodification of resources, for example: installing land ownership signs, planting trees or certain types of plants on land, constructing certain types of buildings on land, and so on.

The data was processed with the help of statistical software, SPSS+ version 26. Data about livelihoods (volume of assets, capabilities, and socio-economic characteristics) and commodification responses in the questionnaire were calculated and grouped into table classes. The data was analyzed first by presenting it in a frequency distribution table and categories. The aim was to see the central tendency or grouping of data so that it can facilitate analysis. Data were analyzed by testing the hypothesis using inferential statistics. All hypotheses were tested using the Pearson’s Chi-square test because the data was a combination of nominal and ordinal data. The Chi-square test will examine the relationship or, conversely, independence between two variables in one sample (Rana and Singhal, 2015; Turhan, 2020).

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Social and demographic characteristic of respondents

Most of the respondents were men. Their age was dominated by the middle or productive age group. Mean age is 42,3 years. 75% of respondents were married and represented the unit of analysis as one adult household member.

Secondary education level dominated the educational background of respondents which describes the educational characteristics of rural communities in Borobudur District. A small number have received higher education, even though they were still at diploma level. As a comparison, in 2021 around 35% of the population of Magelang Regency only had a secondary school education and the majority will have an elementary school education (<https://pusaka.magelangkab.go.id/penduduk/pendidikan/index>).

Table 1. Social and demographic characteristic of respondents (N=164)

Socio-demographic Profiles	Attributes	n	%
Sex	Female	23	14.0
	Male	141	86.0
Age	Young	29	17.7
	Medium	110	67.1
	Old	25	15.2
Marriage status	Unmarried	31	18.9
	Married	123	75.0
	Widow/Widower	10	6.1
Education	Primary School*	32	19.5
	Secondary School	63	38.4
	Tertiary School	47	28.7
	Undergraduated	19	11.6
	Graduated	3	1.8
Main employment status	Not employed	2	1.2
	House work	9	5.5
	Farmer/peasant worker	57	34.8
	Entrepreneur	12	7.3
	Government employees	7	4.3
	Private sector employees	31	18.9
	Artisan	1	.6
	Peddler	2	1.2
	Driver	6	3.7
	Tourist guide	5	3.0
	Construction worker	12	7.3
Social roles	Others	20	12.2
	Religion leader	6	3.7
	Teacher	2	1.2
	Youth leader	25	15.2
	Environmental activist	12	7.3
	Community group activist	8	4.9
	Community member	89	54.3
Others	22	13.4	

Note: * 1 respondent did not go to school (Source: Survey Data, 2023)

Farming and private employment are the occupations of most respondents. This is related to the characteristics of livelihoods in rural Borobudur area which still depend on agriculture and tourism services. Other jobs are types of work that are related to the two types of work mentioned previously. This simple type of occupation means that they cannot ensure a regular monthly income. A total of 13 respondents were unwilling or unable to state their monthly income. A rough calculation from 151 respondents obtained an income figure of IDR 1,646 million per month. Respondents play diverse social roles. They are involved in youth organizations and community activist groups that carry out functions to strengthen social solidarity.

Commodification of livelihoods in Candirejo Village

Candirejo is one of the villages that has expansively responded to tourism developments in Borobudur District. Its location close to the temple area is a strong attraction for the community to provide various tourism services. Initially accommodation was built in the form of homestays in people's homes due to requests from tourists who wanted to stay longer in the area and at low cost. Expansion of limited land use continues to increase due to the emergence of tourism investment.

In the last ten years, the government has developed infrastructure that makes it easier for both tourists and foreign investors to carry out activities in this village. Through the tourism village program, Candirejo Village has also become one of the locations for the development of the Village Economic Center which is characterized by the construction of more modern homestays and rates equivalent to star hotels.

Commodification can be seen from a lot commercial buildings around the village. Residential houses turned into homestays, restaurants, shops and other commercial buildings related to tourism services. Land prices continue to increase, because many foreign investors are interested in doing business in this strategic village. On the other hand, communities have limited capital and networks to develop their land assets more commercially.

Differences in response based on social roles

Most respondents were neutral regarding the trend of commodification of livelihoods occurring in the village (Table 2). This description applies to all respondents with the various social roles they play. This 'floating' response can be seen from their willingness to, on the one hand, change land use patterns, both agricultural land and homesteads to become commercial arenas related to tourism. On the other hand, they also try to survive with agricultural activities or combine them with tourism activities in limited scope.

Tourism provides economic opportunities for residents to earn income directly and relatively quickly, so that actions to optimize the commercial function of assets (land and houses) become a rational choice. Similar revenue is rather difficult to obtain if they rely entirely on agricultural activities.

Table 2. Responses to the commodification of livelihoods based on the respondent's social role

Response to commodification	Social roles						Total
	Ordinary citizen	Religious leaders	Youth figure	Environmental figures	Farmers, street vendors, teachers, Pokdarwis*	Others	
Agree	12 (13.5)	1 (16.7)	6 (20)	2 (16.7)	3 (33,3)	3 (13.1)	27 (16.5)
Neutral	72 (80.9)	5 (83.3)	20 (80)	10 (83.3)	5 (55.6)	20 (86.9)	132 (80.5)
Disagree	5 (5.6)	0	0	0	1 (11.1)	0	6 (3.0)
Total	89 (100)	6 (100)	25 (100)	12 (100)	9 (100)	23 (100)	164 (100)

Note: * Group of tourism care (Source: Survey data, 2023)

The results of statistical tests confirm the picture above, namely that there are significant differences in people's responses to the commodification of livelihoods based on the social roles they play. The difference test using Pearson's Chi-square produces a value of $\chi^2 = 23.843$; $df = 10$; $p = .160^{**}$. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. The different roles and functions of respondents are a strong reason for the emergence of differences in responses to commodification.

Their response to the commodification of livelihoods can also be similar when viewed from the education level category. Most respondents responded neutrally to the commodification of livelihood assets, whether they had an education equivalent to primary school, secondary school, or a diploma or bachelor's degree (Table 3). Respondents with higher education were more agreeable than those with less education. This is interesting, because it is related to the knowledge (social capital) they have which opens up more opportunities for them to gain value from the commodification.

Table 3. Responses to the commodification of livelihoods based on educational level

Asset volume	Education Level			Total
	Primary School	High School	Higher education	
Agree	2 (6.3)	19 (17.3)	4 (18.2)	25 (15.2)
Neutral	25 (78.1)	81 (73.6)	12 (54.5)	118 (72.0)
Disagree	5 (15.6)	10 (9.1)	6 (27.3)	21 (12.8)
Total	32 (100)	110 (100)	22 (100)	164 (100)

Source: Survey data (2023)

The results of the Pearson's Chi-square statistical test show that there are significant differences in people's responses to the commodification of livelihoods based on the social role of each respondent, namely $\chi^2 = 34.098$; $df = 4$; $p = .012^*$. Thus, the hypothesis that there is no difference between the two is accepted.

Volume of livelihood assets based on and level of education

Asset volume is distributed normally among respondents. This means that only a small percentage of them have a small volume of assets, as does the percentage of those who have large assets. Most respondents have medium category assets.

The secondary education level that is dominant among respondents makes a difference to the volume of assets. There is a tendency that the higher the education, the greater the volume of assets. Table 4 shows that the percentage of those with high education and large asset volumes is proven to be higher than the percentage of those with low or medium education. This means that a significant difference in the volume of livelihood assets according to education level is proven and thus the null hypothesis is rejected. The results of the Pearson's Chi-square statistical test are $\chi^2 = 32.780$; $df = 4$; $p = .001^*$

Table 4. Volume of livelihood assets based on education level

Volume of assets	Education Level			Total
	Primary School	High School	Under/postgraduate	
Big	4 (12.5)	19 (17.3)	4 (18.2)	27 (16.2)
Moderate	25 (75.8)	90 (81.8)	16 (72.7)	131 (80.0)
Small	3 (9.3)	1 (0.9)	2 (9.1)	6 (3.8)
Total	32 (100)	110 (100)	22 (100)	164 (100)

Source: Survey data (2023)

Differences in response based on livelihood asset volume groups

A large volume of livelihood assets is only owned by a small proportion (around 15%) of respondents and slightly more than those who own a small volume of assets (around 13%). These assets are an accumulation of natural capital, infrastructure capital, human resource capital, financial capital and social capital. In the context of the Borobudur Area, the volume of asset ownership among residents is relatively easy to change in line with the increasingly intensive money economic transactions, especially through tourism.

However, society's response to the commercialization and commodification of livelihood assets still depends on the volume of assets they own. For example, none of the respondents who own large volumes of assets reject commodification (Table 5). On the other hand, those whose volume of livelihood assets is medium and small scale still reject this happening in Candirejo Village. This disclaimer can be understood as a way to protect ownership of the asset from the possible loss of control over it. For example, if the asset is repurposed and they are unable to manage it according to the demands of the new production pattern that follows, then their control will be lost or their access to the asset will be increasingly limited..

Table 5. Response to commodification based on volume of livelihood assets

Response to commodification	Volume of livelihood assets			Total
	Big	Moderate	Small	
Agree	7 (29.2)	16 (13.6)	4 (18.2)	27 (16.2)
Neutral	17 (70.8)	97 (82.2)	17 (77.3)	131 (80.0)
Disagree	0	5 (4.2)	1 (4.5)	6 (3.8)
Total	24 (100)	118 (100)	22 (100)	164 (100)

Source: Survey Data (2023)

Thus, the hypothesis that there is no significant difference in community response to commodification based on the volume of livelihood assets commodified in tourism destinations is rejected. Pearson's Chi-square statistical test results $\chi^2 = 4.669$; $df = 4$; $p = .005^{**}$.

The aim of the research is to find out the community's response to the commodification of livelihood assets in tourist villages. Villages located in tourism destinations are proven to be experiencing a process of commodification of their community's livelihood assets. The increasing number of visitors to Borobudur Temple is accompanied by increasing demand for supporting services and attractions outside the temple complex. In this context, as many as twenty tourist villages in the Borobudur Temple area, including Candirejo Village, were positively affected by the demand for these services in terms of physical and cultural assets of the villagers.

In this situation, people show significant differences in response. The majority of village residents responded 'neutral', in the sense of neither rejecting nor fully accepting these real changes. The figure reached two thirds of the entire survey population stating this neutral position. Less than ten percent of the survey population stated that they did not agree with the practice of livelihoods commodification. This fact shows that the people of Borobudur, especially Candirejo Village, experience ambivalent attitudes towards tourism development in the area. On the other side, tourism has developed since the 1980s in the area and created a significant contribution to people's livelihoods (Wiratmoko, 2012). On other side, tourism that commodifies their livelihoods is responded to with a 'neutral' or less convincing response. This fact confirms the claims of previous researchers, that local communities have certain concerns about the growth of tourism which may not always have a good impact on the quality of their livelihoods (Wani et al., 2023; Mbaiwa, 2009).

Young and Markam (2020) emphasize that the commodification of livelihood assets in tourism covers almost all parts of the earth's surface that can provide beneficial value. In Candirejo Village, this is evident from the use of most livelihood assets, such as land and non-land, for tourism economic purposes. Agricultural land, hills with unique views, artifacts, rivers, trees and plant species are used as commodities to increase the value of economic benefits oriented towards tourism services. This commodification is seen in the form of conversion of agricultural land into accommodation, restaurants, painting studios, use of rivers for white water rafting activities, scheduled cultural performances for tourists, etc. (Wiratmo, 2012; Wahyuhana et al., 2019).

Young and Markam (2020) emphasize that the commodification of livelihood assets in tourism covers almost all parts of the earth's surface that can provide beneficial value. In Candirejo Village, this is confirmed and clearly visible from the use of most of the land and non-land assets for tourism economic purposes. This commodification appears in the form of conversion of agricultural land into accommodation, restaurants, painting studios, use of rivers for white water rafting activities, scheduled cultural performances for tourists, etc. (Wiratmo, 2012; Erwin, Erwin and Ulung, 2012). Agricultural land, hills with unique views, artifacts, rivers, trees and plant species are used as commodities to increase the value of economic benefits oriented towards tourism services. This commodification is seen in the form of conversion of agricultural land into accommodation, restaurants, painting studios, use of rivers for white water rafting activities, scheduled cultural performances for tourists, etc. (Wiratmo, 2012; Wahyuhana et al., 2019).

This study also shows that different community responses to the livelihoods commodification in Candirejo Village are not related to education factors. The livelihood commodification is a simple form of social innovation to increase added value. Changing the function of land and increasing sources of income from activities created by tourism is one of the easiest responses to be carried out by people in tourism destinations (Untari et al, 2019). However, this finding is different from previous studies which show that

the level of education enables a person or group in an organization to utilize available resources to achieve economic opportunities (Na, 2019) and develop their livelihood activities (Kariyani and Meitriana, 2022).

Differences in responses to the livelihoods commodification are also related to a person's social position and/or role. Key figures in the society often have different views than ordinary people regarding the changes that occur in their environment. As discovered by Kurniaty (2014), the role of local community elites is very significant in the process of changing the use of local assets, even though this is not always in line with the expectations of ordinary people. These results also confirm Dasgupta and Beard's (2007) study regarding the strong role of local elites in utilizing livelihood opportunities introduced through urban community empowerment programs. The commodification of livelihoods could be understood as a form of transformation of the function and ownership of community assets which for the elite of society can be easily accepted.

The volume of assets play an important role in determining attitudes and actions to respond to change. In this study it was shown that people who have large livelihood assets agree more with the practice of livelihood commodification compared to those who have small or medium assets. These findings confirm previous studies, that asset or resource ownership factors differentiate community responses and actions in tourism development (Rukmana and Syam, 2021). A large volume of assets may reduce a person's risk of losing their source of livelihood, while increasing their capacity to achieve economic and social benefits. Under such conditions, they are more responsive to socio-economic transformation through the livelihoods commodification around them.

What can be underlined here is that the local community's response to the commodification of livelihood assets becomes a specific theme of the issues discussed by previous research on perceived value, positive-negative impacts, attitudes and behavior (Segota, Mihalic, and Perdue, 2022; Chen and Kong, 2021). Thus, this study contributes new social facts about the importance of assessing specific community responses to the ownership of livelihood assets.

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This research focuses on society's response to the commodification of livelihood assets accumulated from various elements of social, natural, infrastructure, financial and human capital, so it assumes that the response is the same regardless of category. The general conclusion is that commodification of livelihood assets occurs in Candirejo Village and is responded to differently by the local community. In this regard, the following specific conclusions can be drawn. First, the different social roles of village residents are one of the factors that influence different responses to the commodification of livelihood assets. Second, the level of education is not significantly related to differences in responses to the commodification of livelihoods. Third, the size of the volume of livelihood assets owned by a person is significantly related to different responses to the commodification of livelihood assets in tourism destinations. This study contributes to a broader theoretical explanation of differences in community responses to the commodification of livelihoods in tourism destinations. In this case, the variables of social role and the volume of assets owned by the community play a significant role. It is important to consider these two variables in designing changes to be made in the destination development to prevent social dichotomy in the society. In formulating policies, it is necessary to adopt differences in community responses to changes of the function of community livelihood assets in development programs so that commodification is not the sole choice for all communities to improve the quality of their livelihoods. For community empowerment practitioners, these findings can be used to choose a more effective form of strengthening community capacity based on the characteristics of social roles and the volume of asset ownership. For further research, it is necessary to analyze more specifically the differences in their responses based on categories of livelihood assets to find the capital elements that best determine different or similar responses to the commodification of village community livelihoods.

5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors thanks to Postgraduate School of Universitas Gadjah Mada for financing this research.

6. REFERENCES

Abbay, A. G., Rutten, R., Azadi, H., & Witlox, F. (2019). How Social Status Contributes to Sustainable Livelihoods? An Empirical Analysis in Ethiopia. *Sustainability*, 11(68). doi:10.3390/su11010068

- Adveni, L.V. , & Razali, G. (2022). Hypercapitalism and Product Commodification through Digital-based Marketing Communications in Komodo National Park. *International Journal of Travel, Hospitality and Events*, 1(2), 140-149. <https://doi.org/10.56743/ijothe.v1i2.14>
- Alamineh, G.A., Hussein, J.W., and Mulu, Y.W., & Tadesse, B. (2023). The negative cultural impact of tourism and its implication on sustainable development in Amhara Regional State. *Cogent Arts & Humanities*, 10, 2224597. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23311983.2023.2224597>
- Bai, L., & Weng, S. (2023). New Perspective of Cultural Sustainability: Exploring Tourism Commodification and Cultural Layers. *Sustainability* 2023, 15(13), 9880; <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15139880>.
- Bires, Z., & Raj, S. (2020). Tourism as a pathway to livelihood diversification: Evidence from biosphere reserves, Ethiopia. *Tourism Management*, 81, 104159. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2020.104159>
- BPS Kabupaten Magelang. (2024). *Jumlah Pengunjung Obyek Wisata Candi Borobudur Menurut Asal Wisatawan dan Bulan di Kabupaten Magelang 2017-2019 dan 2020-2022*. <https://magelangkab.bps.go.id/indicator/16/327/1/jumlah-pengunjung-obyek-wisata-candi-borobudur-menurut-asal-wisatawan-dan-bulan-di-kabupaten-magelang.html>
- Chambers, R., & Conway, G. (1991). *Sustainable Rural Livelihoods: Practical Concepts for the 21st Century*. <https://www.ids.ac.uk/download.php?file=files/Dp296.pdf>
- Chen, P., and Kong, X. (2021). Tourism-Led Commodification of Place and Rural Transformation Development: A Case Study of Xixinan Village, Huangshan, China. *Land*, 10(694). <https://doi.org/10.3390/land10070694>
- Cheung, A. K-L. (2021). Structured Questionnaires. In: *Encyclopedia of Quality of Life and Well-Being Research*. Cham, Switzerland: Springer.
- Chowa, G.A.N., & Masa, R. D. (2013). The Impact of Asset Ownership on the Future Orientation of Youth and Their Parents: Evidence from the YouthSave Ghana Experiment. CSD Working Papers No. 13-19, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, USA. https://openscholarship.wustl.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1740&context=csd_research
- Colorni, R. R. (2018). *Tourism and Land Grabbing in Bali: A Research Brief*. Amsterdam. https://www.tni.org/files/publication-downloads/tourism_and_land_grabbing_in_bali.pdf, diakses 1.3.2019.
- Cornet, C. (2015). Tourism development and resistance in ethnic China. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 52, 29–43. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2015.02.002>
- Dasgupta, A., & Beard, V. A. (2007). Community Driven Development, Collective Action and Elite Capture in Indonesia. *Development and Change* 38(2), 229–249.
- Delita, F., Berutu, N., Tanjung, F., & Rambe, T. (2024). Resident's Attitudes Toward Tourism Development in Simanindo Subdistrict Samosir Regency. Paper presented on *The 3rd International Conference on Humanities Education, Law and Social Sciences*, KnE Social Sciences, 1165–1180. DOI 10.18502/kss.v9i2.14932
- Effendi, S., & Tukiran. (2012). *Metode Penelitian Survei*. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Eldh, A.N., Rycroft-Malone, J., van der Zijpp, T., McMullan, C., & Hawkes, C. (2020). Using Nonparticipant Observation as a Method to Understand Implementation Context in Evidence-Based Practice. *Worldviews on Evidence-Based Nursing*, 17(3), 185–192.
- Erwin, L.T., Erwin, A., & Ulung, G. (2012). *Desa Wisata Borobudur*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Eslami, S., Khalifah, Z., Mardani, A., Streimikiene, D., & Han, H. (2019). Community attachment, tourism impacts, quality of life and residents' support for sustainable tourism development. *Journal of Travel & Tourism Marketing*, 36(9), 1061-1079, DOI: 10.1080/10548408.2019.1689224
- Ganeshamoorthy, K. (2019). The employment effect of tourism: A dynamic analysis. *American Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Research*, 3(10), 119- 126.
- Gibson, C. (2009). Geographies of tourism: critical research on capitalism and local livelihoods. *Progress in Human Geography*, 33(4), 527–534. DOI: 10.1177/030913250809979
- Hall, D. (2022). 'Commodification of everything' arguments in social sciences: Variants, specification, evaluation, critique. *Environment and Planning A* 55(3), 544–561.
- Harris, L.R., & Brown, G.T.L. (2019). Mixing interview and questionnaire methods: Practical problems in aligning data. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 15(1). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.7275/959j-ky83>
- Karim, A. (2008). *Kapitalisasi Pariwisata dan Marginalisasi Masyarakat Lokal di Lombok*. Yogyakarta: Genta Press.
- Kariyani, N. N. Y., & Meitriana, M.A. (2022). Pengaruh Tingkat Pendidikan, Modal dan Teknologi terhadap Daya Saing Usaha Mikro, Kecil dan Menengah (UMKM) di Kecamatan Sawan. *Jurnal Pendidikan Ekonomi Undiksha*, 14(1), 1-11. <https://doi.org/10.23887/jjpe.v14i1.36385>

- Kretzmann, J. P., McKnight, J. L., & Sheehan, G. (1997). *A guide to capacity inventories: Mobilizing the community skills of local residents*. Chicago: ACTA Publications.
- Kurniaty, R. (2014). Local Elites and Public Space Sustainability: the local elite roles in the presence and usage of public space in Malang Raya, Indonesia. *Procedia Environmental Sciences*, 20 (2014) 506 – 515. doi: 10.1016/j.proenv.2014.03.063. Available online at www.sciencedirect.com.
- Kusumawardhani, E.E., & Giyarsih, S.R. (2023). Residential Land Prices Changes and Tourism Development in Watukarung Village Pacitan Regency Within Local Communities Perspective. *Geosfera Indonesia*, 8(2), 206-215. <https://doi.org/10.19184/geosi.v8i2.39148>
- Lasso, A., and Dahles, H. (2018). Are tourism livelihoods sustainable? Tourism development and economic transformation on Komodo Island, Indonesia. *Asia Pacific Journal of Tourism Research*, 23(5), 473-485, DOI: 10.1080/10941665.2018.1467939
- Lavesque, R.J.R. (2016). "Commodification", in : *Encyclopedia of Adolescence*. Springer, hal. 1-5.
- Leavy, P. (2017). *Research Design Quantitative, Qualitative, Mixed Methods, Arts-Based, and Community-Based Participatory Research Approaches*. New York & London: The Guilford Press.
- Lee, V., & Landers, R. N. (2022). Sampling Strategies for Quantitative and Qualitative Business Research. *Oxford Research Encyclopaedias*. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acrefore/9780190224851.013.21>
- Mantra, I. B., & Kasto. (2012). "Populasi dan Sampling", In: S. Effendi & Tukiran (eds.), *Metode Penelitian Survei*. Jakarta: LP3ES.
- Mason, P. (2003). *Tourism Impacts, Planning and Management*. Oxford: Butterworth-Heinemann.
- Mbaiwa, J. E.(2009). "Tourism Development, Rural Livelihoods and Biodiversity Conservation in the Okavango Delta, Botswana", in: P. Hottola (ed.). *Tourism Strategies and Local Responses in Southern Africa*, pp. 90-104. Oxon, UK: CAB International.
- McGehee, N. G., & Andereck, K. L. (2004). Factors Predicting Rural Residents' Support of Tourism. *Journal of Travel Research*, 43(2), 131-140. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0047287504268234>
- Na, K. (2021). The Effect of On-the-Job Training and Education Level of Employees on Innovation in Emerging Markets. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*,7(1), 47.<https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc7010047>.
- Neef, A. (2019). *Tourism, Land Grabs and Displacement: A Study with Particular Focus on the Global South*. Auckland.
- Neuman, W. L. (2016). *Metodologi Penelitian Sosial: Pendekatan Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif*. Jakarta: Indeks.
- Nugroho, P., & Numata, S. (2022). Resident support of community-based tourism development: Evidence from Gunung Ciremai National Park, Indonesia. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 30(11), 2510-2525. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2020.1755675>
- Nunkoo, R., & Gursoy, D. (2011). Residents' Support for Tourism: An identity perspective. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(1), 243-268. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2011.05.006>
- Nunkoo, R., & So, K. K. F. (2016). Residents' Support for Tourism: Testing Alternative Structural Models. *Journal of Travel Research*, 55(7) 847-861. DOI: 10.1177/0047287515592972
- Otsuki, K. (2023). Contested values of development: Experiencing commodification of livelihoods through displacement and resettlement in Mozambique. *Environment and Planning A: Economic and Space*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0308518X231182431>
- Park, D-B, Nunkoo, R., & Yoon, Y-S. (2015). Rural residents' attitudes to tourism and the moderating effects of social capital. *Tourism Geography*, 17(1), 112-133. doi: 10.1080/14616688.2014.959993.
- Picard, M. (1990). Cultural Tourism in Bali: Cultural Performances as Tourist Attraction. *Indonesia*, 49, 37-74. <https://doi.org/10.2307/3351053>
- Pozzo, M. I., Borgobello, A., & Pierella, M. P. (2019). Using questionnaires in research on universities: analysis of experiences from a situated perspective. *REIRE Revista d'Innovació i Recerca en Educació*, 12(2), 1-16. <http://doi.org/10.1344/reire2019.12.227010>
- Rachmawati, E., Fountain, J., & Mackay, M. (2021). Factors Influencing Economic Empowerment in Tourism Development. *Economics and Finance in Indonesia*, 67(2), Article 5. DOI: 10.47291/efi.v67i2.917. <https://scholarhub.ui.ac.id/efi/vol67/iss2/5>
- Rosenblatt, T. (2005). Lakeside living: commodifying community in a master planned estate. *State of Australian Cities Conference*, Brisbane, 30 November - 2 December, 1-15.
- Rua, S. V. (2020). Perceptions of tourism: a study of residents' attitudes towards tourism in the city of Girona. *Journal of Tourism Analysis: Revista de Análisis Turístico*, 27(2), 165-184. DOI 10.1108/JTA-03-2019-0015
- Rukmana, N. S., & Syam, F. (2021). "The Role of Actors in Managing Collaborative Tourism in Indonesia", *IAPA 2022 International Conference and International Indonesia Conference on Interdisciplinary Studies (IICIS)*, KnE Social Sciences, 104-113. DOI 10.18502/kss.v8i5.12992
- Jugmohan, S., Spencer, J.P. & Steyn, J.N. (2016). Local natural and cultural heritage assets and community based tourism:

- Challenges and opportunities. *African Journal for Physical Activity and Health Sciences*, 22(1:2), 306-317.
- Salazar, N. B. (2012). Community-based cultural tourism: issues, threats and opportunities. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 20(1), 9-22. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2011.596279>
- Segota, T., Mihalic, T., & Perdue, R.R. (2022). Resident perceptions and responses to tourism: individual vs community level impacts. *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, <https://doi.org/10.1080/09669582.2022.2149759>.
- Shepherd, R. (2002). Commodification, culture and tourism. *Tourist studies*, 2, 183-203. <https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/146879702761936653>
- Sinha, A.A., Behera, H.C., Behura, A.K., Sahoo, A.K., & De, U.K. (2020). Livelihood Assets and Income Generating Activities: A Comparative Analysis in the Scheduled and NonScheduled Areas of Jharkhand. *Indian Journal of Human Development* 15(3), 443-467. DOI: 10.1177/09737030211064929
- Sugiyono. (2020). *Metode Penelitian Pariwisata*. Bandung: Alfabeta.
- Turner, S. (2007). Small-scale enterprise livelihoods and social capital in Eastern Indonesia. *The Professional Geographer*, 59, 407-20. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9272.2007.00631.x>
- Untari, R., Avenzora, R., Darusman, D., & Sunarminto, T. (2019). Community Responses to Nature-based Tourism Promotion Materials in Indonesia. *Jurnal Manajemen Hutan Tropika*, 2(1), DOI: 10.7226/jtfm.5.1.17
- Van Vuuren, C., & Slabbert, E. (2011). Travel Motivations and Behaviour of Tourists to a South African Resort. *Tourism & Management Studies*, 1, 295-304. <http://www.redalyc.org/articulo.oa?id=388743867027>
- Wahyuhana, R.T., Sukmawati, A.M., Annisa, L.F., & Yusuf, I.I. (2019). Impact of Baron Tourism Areas on Local Economic Development and Changes in Land Use in Gunungkidul Regency. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, volume 436. <https://doi.org/10.2991/assehr.k.200529.240>
- Wani, M. S., Bhat, M. S., Alam, A., & Mir, S. A.(2023). Assessing indigenous community's perspectives and attitudes toward tourism development impacts in the northwestern Himalayas, India. *Socio-Ecological Practice Research*, 5, 63-78. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s42532-022-00134-6>
- Wijayanto, H. W., Affandi, A., & Soemarno. (2019). Pengaruh Livelihood Asset terhadap Livelihood Strategies Masyarakat Tepi Hutan di UB Forest, Desa Tawangargo, Kecamatan Karangploso, Kabupaten Malang. *Habitat*,30(2), 54-61. <https://doi.org/10.21776/ub.habitat.2019.030.2.7>
- Williams, C. (2007). Research Methods. *Journal of Business & Economic Research*, 5(3), 65-72.
- Wiratmoko, B. A. (2012). Pengaruh Taman Wisata Candi Borobudur terhadap Kondisi Kehidupan Sosial Ekonomi Masyarakat Kabupaten Magelang 1980-1990. *Journal of Indonesian History*, 1(2), 125-133.
- Young, M., & Markham, F. (2020). Tourism, capital, and the commodification of place. *Progress in Human Geography*, 44(2), 276-296. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0309132519826679>
- Yun, H. J., & Zhang, X. (2017). Cultural conservation and residents' attitudes about ethnic minority tourism. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 17(2), 165-175. DOI: 10.1177/1467358415610624