

# Evaluating Participation for Tourism in Heritage Urban Settlements: A Case Study of Kampung Kemas, Gresik, Indonesia

Dian Rahmawati\*, Rimadewi Supriharjo, Eko Budi Santoso, Rulli Pratiwi Setiawan, Karina Pradinie,  
Mochamad Yusuf

Dept. of Urban and Regional Planning, Institut Teknologi Sepuluh Nopember,  
Surabaya, Indonesia

\*Corresponding author's email: [d\\_rahmawati \[AT\] urplan.its.ac.id](mailto:d_rahmawati@urplan.its.ac.id)

---

**ABSTRACT**— *The aim of this article was to determine the form of evaluation related to tourism activities in urban heritage area by a case study in Kampung Kemas, Gresik, Indonesia. In the study, observations and interviews were made to evaluate the tourism activities and participation which occurs. In this context, there are 4 activities that classified in tourism terms, and all of them involves the community and other stakeholders' participation. Compared to another study in the same context, it is found that there should be more opportunities expanded. This evaluation results provide suggestions for the local government to improve the quality of participation-based tourism development in Gresik.*

**Keywords**— community-based tourism, participation, heritage tourism

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

Over the last three decades, tourism has emerged as a major force in the global economy, with most countries, whether developed or developing, have increasing opportunities to participate, as both host and guest, in this socio-economic phenomenon (Lewis et al, 2007). Tourism is also highly dependent on natural capital i.e. wildlife and culture. According to Torres and Momsen (2004) this may potentially provide local people with an opportunity to leverage their assets to obtain equity in joint venture partnerships, as well as to extract value and decision-making power through their ownership of unique tourism resources. It clearly reveals about correlation between tourism and local participation which also reaffirmed by Timothy (1999) who conveys about two perspectives of participation in tourism. Those are consist of participation in decision making and participation in gaining benefit from tourism development. They could earned benefit by planning in getting local people interests in order to put up bigger social control to embody welfare. Participation in tourism is one of the way to achieve a sustainable tourism development (UNDP, 2000). The aim of this act is for obviating welfare disparities between tourist and local in a tourism destination therefore any conflicts or dominating issues with one another can be avoided. This also supported by a small bussines leading by the local itself.

In tourism, participation often related to community-based tourism concept. The concept is used very flexibly. From a review of the academic literature it is clear that CBT is defined as tourism owned and/or managed by communities and intended to deliver wider community benefit, benefiting a wider group than those employed in the initiative. The community contributes time and labour – it's investment in the initiative. The time and labour of the community has value, these are often significant opportunity costs. But CBT also have exception and critics. For the poorest communities, engagement is prohibitive; they cannot afford to be distracted from subsistence activities. Goodwin and Santilli (2009) also stated that there is insufficient rigour in the use of the concept of Community-Based Tourism (CBT). Results of some research revealed the most mentioned criteria for the success of CBT initiatives fell in the category of social capital and empowerment (Puspito et al, 2016).

As the study case of evaluating participation in tourism, especially in heritage urban settlements, one located in Gresik, East Java, Indonesia has been chosen. It is named as Kampung Kemas to recall a glorious era where a wealth family lived there in 1855. The glorious emerged from their great architectural building's style and their important role for promoting local entrepreneurship. Their pretentious houses were constructed by selected builders from Chinese imigrant. The building form were adapted from Chinese and Colonial style acculturation (Supriharjo et al, 2015; Rahmawati et al, 2014). This article first proceeds with a review of the relevant literature on evaluations and then offers a framework devised for evaluating participatory initiatives.

## **2. FRAMEWORK**

The framework of this article begins with a question : “in what extent does the community as the subject of CBT connected with tourism activity as the object itself?” The approach used in this article is to measure the important variable which had been defined with case study in Kemasan, that is: heritage planning, government policy, social behaviour, socio-culture, and historical an spatial values (Supriharjo et al, 2015) and their relation with participation and community.

Form of participations exist in Kampung Kemasan: who do what and kind of participation network, were came out through social network analysis using observation and in-depth interview (IDI). These were the following methods:

1. Researcher Ethnographic :  
Researcher held a 7 days observation in Kampung Kemasan and surrounding, together with log book/diary related to activities and analysis. The observation units were:
  - a. Socio-economics and cultural characteristic of local people.
  - b. Local behaviour of people surround Kampung Kemasan.
  - c. Perceptual map of participation activities surround Kampung Kemasan.
2. In Depth Interview to Experts :  
The interview was intended for several respondents by these following characteristics:
  - a. Had been living in Kampung Kemasan for the last 15 years.
  - b. Inherited histories, myths, quotes, and documents (letters or diaries), photographs, sktechs or perceptual map of participation activities in Kampung Kemasan.
  - c. One of the half-breed heritgae building owner.
  - d. Had been experienced the glorious era of Kampung Kemasan and the difference of current condition.

## **3. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSIONS**

Participation components observed by the actors, the actions, forms of participations, and the networking. Participation has been a long history in Kampung Kemasan. Started from The Kemas Family in Grisee (the old name of Gresik city), that have five children of which they were all large entrepreneurs in 19<sup>th</sup> century. Their well-known family bussiness in cowhide and swallow were highly contributed to Gresik’s trading development. The trading distribution were evolving abroad and gaining great success that widely affected culture and socio-economic in Gresik. The cowhide’s tannery was encouraging local entrepreneurship to compete with Chinesse and Arabic wholesalers. This became a great breakthrough in promoting local merchant as the indigenous people had a difficult phase to grow up their bussiness in Colonial era.

The five variables from the previous research (Supriharjo et al, 2015) have a correlation with participation of local people in Kampung Kemasan. Generally, government acts are obligating and permitting. Obligate means the policies are tend to be enforce to educate and cure people, therefore the involvement of local participant can be increased. On the other hand, permitting is essentially provides a wide chances for local people to participate. It is a local power to be involved in decided according to their interest. This may local people to negotiate and engage in trade-offs with traditional power holders. By this following table, participation components in Kampung Kemasan are observed by the forms of participations, the actors, the actions, and the networking.

**Table 1:** Observation of participation component in Kampung Kemasan

Forms of Participation	Actions	
	Government	Local People
Marketable entity development through exploring socio-culture activities	<p><u>Obligate</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formulating rule of law for holding some annual cultural events in Kampung Kemasan</li> </ul> <p><u>Permit</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Encourage heritage tourism development (cultural events or heritage settlements tour) with local participation engage</li> <li>Arrange a technical or language training for local people</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Maintain “Mata Seger” as their culture community</li> <li>Form an interest group or a regular social gathering</li> <li>Hosting and guiding tourist in Kampung Kemasan tour</li> <li>Preserve “Bandeng Market” as a cultural market</li> </ul>
Coordination of preservation management	<p><u>Obligate</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Formulating policies and rule of law for local participation</li> <li>Strengthening framework institution of the government &amp; supporting administration by formulating heritage building maintenance and protection guidance</li> </ul> <p><u>Permit</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Increasing social awrness, through “educate” and “cure” local people about the importance of heritage preservation</li> <li>Accomodate private sector for holding their CSR program in Kampung Kemasan</li> </ul>	<p><u>Maintaining</u> Building restoration</p> <p><u>Protecting</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Minimize building functional shift</li> <li>Registered the heritage building</li> <li>Negotiate and engage in trade-offs with traditional power holders for getting insentives and compensations</li> </ul>
Urban industry area establishment	<p><u>Permit</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Accomodate access direct job in the tourism sector for local people</li> <li>Promote and making publication of Kampung Kemasan as heritage settlement</li> </ul>	Establish or inovate new tourism activities
Social behaviour encouragement	<p><u>Permit</u></p> <p>Accomodate a routine activity and socialization to maintain local pride of the current artifacts</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>A strength sense of belonging by keeping their house as an inherit from their ancestor</li> <li>Believing their kampung as a comfort and proper place an to stay for their most elderly resident</li> <li>Precieving their kampung as recreational area</li> <li>Keeping their kampung cleanliness</li> <li>Regard their kampung has an pretentious achitectoral design with aesthetic value</li> </ul>

Several case studies give other sights as recommendation to strengthen participation in Kampung Kemas, from these following situations:

1. Case study of Pro-Poor Tourism (PPT) in Trinidad & Tobago, St. Lucia, and West Nepal. Cooperation with tourism business firm as an outsider that maintain their focus on sustainable tourism development through **business opportunities expansion, employment opportunities, building a supportive policy and planning framework, developing local institutions**. Facilitating a broader and improved distribution of the benefits of the existing tourism sector (cruise ship passengers and stay-over visitors); and creating a new complementary sub sector, qualified as Heritage Tourism, aimed at **a new clientele** (Renard, 2001). The adoption of PPT as a strategy to contribute to further poverty reduction. While tourism in itself is insufficient as a poverty reduction strategy, it could be a significant component of a broader pro-poor economic growth strategy. At the core of PPT is putting the livelihoods of the poor as the central focus. **A combination of macro and micro level strategies** are necessary to transform principles into action.
2. Heritage (Goodwin et al, 2009) in Shigar Fort Residence, Pakistan. Unconventional CBT that is in form of heritage hotel with strong community engagement. Heritage hotel development with no less than 20 rooms and 27 beds incorporating a small museum. Hotel also organizes guiding, excursions, and transportation can also be arranged. There is also a restaurant. Ownership of the hotel will pass to the community in 10 to 15 years time. Since Shigar Fort is situated in the immediate proximity of a poor and unskilled village population the project provided a perfect opportunity to act as a catalyst for comprehensive improvement of the local economy. The impact of the work of AKCSP has been significant in creating a catalytic effect on the revitalization of Shigar providing **employment opportunities, raising incomes, restoring cultural and historical pride, promoting good governance via the civil society organization**, the Shigar Town Management Development Society (STMDS), improving the quality of life and most importantly restoring hope in the community. Since opening in 2004, 20% of the hotels net profits and 10% of the transport revenue is ploughed back into the community of Shigar via STMDS. The funds contributed are for social projects as well as cultural activities in Shigar. Additionally the AKDN organizations have developed partnerships with donors and NGOs in Shigar leading to the restoration of other important cultural heritage assets as well as **community development and infrastructure improvement** projects in which **micro finance** has played an important role.

#### 4. CONCLUSIONS

The aim of this article was to determine the form of evaluation related to tourism activities in urban heritage area by a case study in Kampung Kemas, Gresik, Indonesia. In the study, observations and interviews were made to evaluate the tourism activities and participation which occurs. In this context, there are 4 activities that classified in tourism terms, and all of them involves the community and other stakeholders' participation. Those activities create forms of marketable entity development through exploring socio-culture activities, coordination of preservation management, urban industry area establishment, and social behaviour encouragement.

Compared to another study in the same context, it is found that there should be more opportunities expansion to widen the participation, both in decision making and gaining collective benefit. These opportunities may vary from business and employment including finding new clientele, policy and planning, as well as micro finance enhancement. This evaluation results provide suggestions for the local government to improve the quality of participation-based tourism development in Gresik.

#### 5. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

Author would like to acknowledge Ristekdikti and LPPM ITS that support the Kampung Kemas Research in 2015 and continued in 2016 in the scheme of Prime Research in the University (PUPT). Author would also thank the Kampung Kemas research team for the unconditional supports and works.

#### 4. REFERENCES

- [1] Lewis, A., & Brown, T., Pro-Poor Tourism: A Vehicle for Development in Trinidad & Tobago. Crisis, chaos and change: Caribbean Development Challenges in the 21st Century, 2007.
- [2] Goodwin, H., & Santilli, R., Community-based Tourism: A Success? ICRT Occasional Paper 11, 2009.
- [3] Anonim, Agenda 21 Sektorial Agenda Pariwisata untuk Pengembangan Kualitas Hidup Secara Berkelanjutan Jakarta: Proyek Agenda 21 Sektorial Kerjasama Kantor Menteri Negara Lingkungan Hidup dan UNDP, 2000.
- [4] Timothy, D.J., "Participatory Planning a View of Tourism in Indonesia" in Annuals Review of Tourism Research, XXVI (2), 1999.
- [5] Supriharjo et al, "Pelestarian Kawasan Cagar Budaya Kampung Kemas Gresik", Laporan Akhir Penelitian Unggulan Perguruan Tinggi. DIKTI-LPPM ITS 2015.

- [6] Rahmawati, D., Supriharjo, R., Setiawan, R.P., Pradinie, K. Community Participation in Heritage Tourism for Gresik Resilience. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*. Elsevier. 2014.
- [7] Puspito, A.R., Rahmawati, D. Pengembangan Kawasan Agrowisata melalui Pendekatan Community Based Tourism di Kecamatan Bumiaji Kota Batu. *Jurnal Teknik ITS* Vol. 4/ Issue 2. C92-C97. 2016.
- [8] Renard, Yves, “Practical Strategies For Pro-Poor Tourism: Case Study of The St. Lucia Heritage Tourism Programme”, 2001.
- [9] Torres, R. and Momsen, J.H. (2004) Challenges and potential for linking tourism and agriculture to achieve pro-poor tourism objectives, *Progress in Development Studies*, 4(4), 294-318.