

Reformulation of Socially Resilient Village

B. Mujiyadi¹, Nyi R. Irmayani², Habibullah³, Rudy G. Erwinsyah⁴, Nurhayu⁵

{muji015@brin.go.id¹, nyir001@brin.go.id², habi003@brin.go.id³}

Research Center for Social Welfare, Village, and Connectivity, National Research and Innovation Agency, Jakarta, Indonesia^{1,2,3,4}, Research Center for Public Policy National Research and Innovation Agency, Jakarta, Indonesia⁵

Abstract. There have been many policies and strategies on community empowerment programs aimed at realizing prosperous villages. There was a model of empowering social institutions as an effort to increase social resilience by the Ministry of Social Affairs, measured by four indicators: (1) ability to protect the vulnerable villagers; (2) participation in social organizations; (3) ability to prevent social conflicts; and (4) ability to maintain local knowledge for managing natural and social resources. However, the model experiences obstacles, such as high dependency on government assistance, its ceremonial nature, and obscurity in institutions and human resources to actuate. Therefore, research is needed to reformulate the socially resilient village. This research uses qualitative methods through literature studies, interviews, and observations. The results show that social resilience is manifested in terms of togetherness and cooperation among villagers by utilizing local potential and knowledge. Another finding is the ability of communities to access digital technology positively.

Keywords: social resilience, rural development, social welfare

1 Introduction

The development of village capacity is the focus of the Joko Widodo government; various policies, strategies, and programs to actualize prosperous villages have been carried out [1]. However, community welfare does not increase and tends to create the villages' dependency on government assistance [2]–[4]. The Ministry of Social Affairs as the organizer of social welfare development with a focus on efforts to overcome social welfare problems by maximizing the potential and sources of social welfare programs by the Ministry of Social Affairs with a focus on villages, including independent prosperous villages, socially resilient villages and social welfare centers [5]–[7].

Socially resilient village programs have gone through a series of trials and pilots in several locations from 2004–2007, both methodologically and empirically, which have resulted in the dimensions of social resilient village indicators such as increases in community participation in reducing social problems, the more empowered communities in local institutions [5]. Based on these activities, the empowerment of social institutions is contained in the Decree of the Minister of Social Affairs of the Republic of Indonesia number 12/HUK/2006 to create a socially resilient community at the local level.

For the realization of the socially resilient village, the Indonesian Ministry of Social Affairs has formulated four indicators, namely: 1) community involvement in handling people with social welfare problems (*penyandang masalah kesejahteraan sosial* or PMKS) and vulnerable groups; 2) building community participation in local organizations; 3) controlling social conflicts and acts of violence; and 4) maintenance of local wisdom in processing natural resources and social resources.

Although trials have been carried out and there is legal regulation, the socially resilient village program does not continue as the function of the Center for Social Resilience Development (*Pusat Pengembangan Ketahanan Sosial Masyarakat*) becomes the Center for Professional Development of Social Workers and Social Extension Workers (*Pusat Pembinaan Profesi Pekerja Sosial dan Penyuluh Sosial*) in 2011 so that there is no longer a socially resilient village development agency. However, in 2019, the Center for Social Extension (*Pusat Penyuluhan Sosial*), the agency for fostering social extension activities, carried out activities to create the socially resilient village through the human resources it fostered, namely community social extension workers (*penyuluh sosial masyarakat*).

Therefore, it is important to research the concepts and indicators of contemporary socially resilient village programs. Concepts and indicators of the socially resilient village that were developed initially require reformulation to adapt to current conditions—utilizing economic capital found in the village by developing natural potential by technological developments.

2 Methods

This research was conducted in six areas, namely 1) Padang Pariaman Regency, West Sumatra Province, 2) Sukabumi Regency, West Java Province, 3) Purwakarta Regency, West Java Province, 4) Bantul Regency, Special Region of Yogyakarta Province, 5) Tabanan Regency, Bali Province, 6) Kutai Kertanegara Regency, East Kalimantan Province.

This study aims to obtain concepts and indicators of the socially resilient village. The qualitative approach is used in this study. Empirical data were obtained through in-depth interviews, focus group discussions (FGD), and observation. There were 15 informants for this research at the district level from various district government agencies, local media, and academics. There were 15 informants at the village level who came from village officials, community leaders, religious leaders, customary leaders, women, youth, community social instructors and village assistants. In-depth interviews were conducted with other informants who provided information about the conditions, potentials, problems and their handling in the selected regencies and villages.

3 Results and Discussions

3.1 Socially Resilient Village Concept

The socially resilient village model developed from 2006-2011 is a series of standard procedures or steps to carry out an empowerment activity for social institutions. The estuary is that the resulting pattern can build and develop a community social resilience system that is based on the ability of social institutions to manage social capital, able to mobilize local community members to improve: 1) social protection for the vulnerable, poor and people with social

problems; 2) encourage community participation in local social organization activities; 3) control of social conflicts or acts of violence; and 4) maintaining local wisdom in managing natural and social resources.

In 2020, it is further developed by including social extension as an initial movement that precedes before programs or activities enter the village. The social extension is a behavior change process carried out through the dissemination of information, communication, motivation and education by community social extension workers, through speeches, in writing and demonstrations to the target group, so that a common understanding, knowledge, and willingness to participate actively in the administration of welfare emerges [8]. Social extension activities are aimed at individuals, families, groups and/or communities as the in-needs of social welfare services (*pemerlu pelayanan kesejahteraan sosial* or PPKS) and potential sources of social welfare (*potensi sumber kesejahteraan sosial* or PSKS) to create socially resilient village communities. To actualize the socially resilient village, it is required the availability of competent community social extension workers, the creation of an increase in the social capacity of the community, the creation of an increase in the capability of community social institutions and the realization of strengthening community social participation.

In the Developing Villages Index (IDM) developed by the Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration of the Republic of Indonesia [9], one of the indicators is the Social Resilience Index which consists of the dimensions of education, health, social capital and settlements. The IDM results in categorizing villages into very underdeveloped, underdeveloped, developing, advanced, and self-sustaining villages. There are differences in policy approach interventions, including determining different amounts of funds according to the classification status of each village [10].

The socially resilient village as a goal is an ideal expectation so that the community becomes dynamic, capable, resilient, and possesses the fighting power to meet their needs and face various social problems. Community life in the village where mutual assistance, mutual help, kinship, togetherness, and local wisdom preservation run thick, is the hallmark of a society by utilizing the potential and resources in their respective regions.

At each location, the form of the village and village social resilience adapts to local conditions. In Purwakarta Regency, socially resilient villages are identical to cultured villages based on the values of mutual assistance, kinship, cooperation, and local wisdom in implementing community, national and state life to improve village quality [11], [12]. *Adat* village is a unit of customary law community in Bali which has territory, position, original structure, traditional rights, own assets, traditions, manners of the social life of the community from generation to generation in the ties of sacred places, duties and the authority and right to regulate and manage their own household [13], [14]. *Kalurahan* is the designation of a village in the Yogyakarta region. It is a legal community unit consisting of several hamlets with certain territorial boundaries and their own assets, domiciled directly under *Kapanewon* [15], [16]. *Nagari* is a genetically and historically customary law community unit, has boundaries in certain areas, has its own assets, has the authority to choose its leader by deliberation and regulates and manages the interests of the local community based on the philosophy and code of *adat*, the *Adat Basandi Syara'-Syara' Basandi Kitabullah* and/or based on local origins and customs within the province of West Sumatra [17], [18].

Due to the COVID-19 pandemic, people affected by layoffs or reduced income in the city ended up returning to the village. In Tabanan and Sukabumi, village communities synergize with each other, among others, in accepting community members who return home, caring for residents who are positive for COVID-19, and helping find solutions for residents who have lost their livelihoods such as helping start businesses, planting crops in their yards. In Sukabumi, community members independently collect funds at the *RT* level or neighborhood level by adding religious values (*infaq shodaqoh*) in the form of mandatory funds that must be collected for the emergency needs of their underprivileged citizens such as illness or childbirth, environmental cleanliness and safety as well as helping the uninhabitable houses, savings for their own family needs when needed.

A lot of local wisdom emerged during the pandemic, such as the *Jogoriko* (neighborhood shopping) program in Bantul, namely all food products from neighbors to be prioritized to be bought by fellow residents to help the economy of its citizens. In Purwakarta, efforts to develop an attitude of helping to help through the activities of the electorate which are transformed into *e-perelek*. *Beas perelek* is full of social capital with values that correlate with the Sundanese philosophy of life, namely *silih asih*, *silih asah*, *silih asuh* which are based on togetherness in each individual, both within the family and in the community. In Kutai Kartanegara, the lending of vacant land from landowners to land managers is a form of social concern, meaning social solidarity among residents in the village is loaned by people who are more able to provide support to less fortunate people.

At the regency level, several regions have implemented regulations that promote the values of *gotong royong*, kinship, cooperation, and local wisdom in the context of implementing community, national and state life to improve the quality of the village. Purwakarta is one of the regencies that implements a unique educational policy based on local wisdom with the implementation of character education which aims to form a generation of children of the nation who are intelligent, skilled, loving to their homeland and region, independent, able to adapt to their environment, broad-minded, and virtuous character.

Some areas maintain harmony between local communities and migrants through intensive coordination and communication between community leaders, one of which is through *paruman* (consultation) in Bali; besides that, all residents in each environment/region are members of WhatsApp Groups, which village officials manage. Using this information technology, the communication flow in the village is maintained, among others, being able to disseminate information and accommodate the aspirations of all residents, coordinate various activities in the village, to ward off hoaxes circulating in cyberspace. This synergy becomes a valuable lesson in achieving social resilience.

Considering the existing concept of a socially resilient village based on the ability of social institutions to manage social capital and mobilize local community members, it is evident that socially resilient villages have strengthened community participation manifested in terms of togetherness, mutual assistance, and concern among residents. during the COVID-19 pandemic by utilizing the potential and local wisdom in the village. People can help each other first before any outside help. Social extensions can mobilize existing institutions in the community and provide information that can build this togetherness.

3.1 Socially Resilient Village Indicators

There are many opinions regarding the concept and definition of social resilience [19], Steiner & Atterton [20] stated that social resilience is an important indicator of social sustainability, where individual and collective involvement of community members is needed. Activities that develop social resilience must involve the whole community, so social resilience is a participatory process in which every community member plays an active role in identifying solutions to the threats and challenges they face [21].

Social participation and a sense of belonging created through shared socio-cultural construction supported by active interactions at the local level are important components of social resilience. Obrist et al. [22] revealed that social resilience is closely related to the three capitals expressed by Bourdieu: economic capital, social capital, and cultural capital. Economic capital is direct and concrete, can be in the form of money and institutionalized in the form of property rights; cultural capital in the form of knowledge and can be institutionalized in the form of education; Social capital takes the form of connections and social networks and can be institutionalized in the form of social status [23]. The key to social resilience is facilitating people's access to economic, social, and cultural capital [22]. Open access to these three capitals enables social actors not only to cope and adapt to adverse conditions (reactive), but also to create choices and responses (proactive) to reduce and overcome difficulties.

The involvement of individuals and communities in overcoming problems that occur in the community is evident during the current COVID-19 pandemic, where rural communities accept residents who have returned to their villages due to the impact of the pandemic and help each other to restore their health and economic conditions of the residents. The power of social capital in the form of social solidarity, togetherness, community self-help, collecting funds to help others and saving and taking advantage of the natural potential in the village to cultivate agricultural products and establish home industries. Some of these things make a socially resilient society that can overcome its own problems and adapt to bad conditions, and create choices and responses to reduce and overcome the difficulties faced.

The relevance of socially resilient village indicators to actual conditions is explained below.

Table 1. Socially resilient village indicators.

Indicators	Descriptions
Social protection for the vulnerable, poor and people with social problems.	This indicator is still relevant to actual conditions. However, the social protection research location is dominated by social protection carried out by the state through various programs such as the Program Keluarga Harapan, Bantuan Sembako Murah, Program Indonesia Sehat, Bantuan Sosial Tunai and various other social assistance programs. These programs tend to create social jealousy and weaken the social protection that develops in the community.
Encouraging community participation in local social organization activities.	Community participation is getting weaker, cooperation activities are rarely carried out, and community participation is low. It is since the village fund has facilitated public facilities and village officials receive salaries for constructing these public facilities.

Control of social conflicts or acts of violence.	Conflict control in several locations can be carried out with the cooperation of various cross-sectors, especially the synergy between traditional/customary elements, government officials, and local security forces. Conflict prevention is key to intensive communication and coordination between community leaders.
Maintaining local wisdom in managing natural and social resources.	The maintenance of local wisdom in several research locations can be carried out by the community or encouraged by policies issued by local governments such as Purwakarta Regency, Sukabumi Regency, Tabanan Regency, Padang Pariaman Regency and Bantul Regency.
Level of access and utilization of digital technology.	It is the newest indicator formulated from this research. The ability of villagers to access and utilize the infrastructure and use digital technology (internet) positively. Threats and social shocks currently arise from the disclosure of information technology where many hoaxes circulate in the community, so good use of digital technology is expected to maintain social resilience. This digital access and utilization are specifically for villages already connected to the internet.

4. Conclusion

The socially resilient village is a village that can overcome social problems by utilizing the potential and resources of social welfare in the village. These potentials and resources can be human resources, *gotong royong* or cooperation values, kinship, togetherness, local knowledge and wisdom.

Acknowledgments. This paper is one of the outputs of the “Policy Research on Socially Resilient Village” in 2021, funded by the Research and Development Center for Social Welfare, the Ministry of Social Affairs of The Republic of Indonesia. All authors contributed equally to this work as the main contributors. There was no conflict of interest to declare. All authors drafted, read, and approved the final paper.

References

- [1] H. Antlöv, A. Wetterberg, and L. Dharmawan, "Village Governance, Community Life, and the 2014 Village Law in Indonesia," *Bull. Indones. Econ. Stud.*, vol. 52, no. 2, pp. 161–183, May 2016, doi: 10.1080/00074918.2015.1129047.
- [2] A. Salim, W. R. Bulan, B. Untung, I. Laksono, and K. Brock, *Indonesia's Village Law: enabler or constraint for more accountable governance?* Brighton: The Institute of Development Studies, 2017.
- [3] J. McCarthy and M. Sumarto, "Distributional Politics and Social Protection in Indonesia: Dilemma of Layering, Nesting and Social Fit in Jokowi's Poverty Policy," *Southeast Asian Econ.*, vol. 35, no. 2, pp. 223–236, Aug. 2018, doi: 10.1355/ae35-2g.
- [4] A. S. Kusumawati and T. Kudo, "The Effectiveness of Targeting Social Transfer Programs in Indonesia," *J. Perenc. Pembang. Indones. J. Dev. Plan.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 282–297, Dec. 2019, doi: 10.36574/jpp.v3i3.90.
- [5] A. Suhendi, "Model Desa Berketahanan Sosial Dalam Pembangunan Kesejahteraan Sosial," *J. Inf.*, vol. 16, no. 01, pp. 47–60, 2011.
- [6] B. Mujiyadi, M. Syawie, A. Sitepu, S. Suyanto, and A. D. Amalia, *Penelitian tentang Profil dan Pemetaan Potensi Masyarakat dalam Rangka Pengembangan Desa Sejahtera Mandiri*. Jakarta: Pusat Penelitian dan Pengembangan Kesejahteraan Sosial, 2017.
- [7] H. Habibullah, "Peran Pusat Kesejahteraan Sosial dalam Pelayanan Sosial Terintegratif," *Sosio Konsepsia*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 295–306, Sep. 2020, doi: 10.33007/ska.v9i3.2043.
- [8] N. R. Irmayani *et al.*, *Pemetaan Sosial Menuju Desa Berketahanan Sosial Melalui Penyuluh Sosial Masyarakat Sebagai Agen Perubahan*. Jakarta: Pusat Penelitian dan Pengembangan Kesejahteraan Sosial, 2019.
- [9] T. Madjid *et al.*, *Peringkat Status Indeks Desa Membangun (IDM) Tahun 2020*. Jakarta: Kementerian Desa Pembangunan Daerah tertinggal dan Transmigrasi Republik Indonesia, 2020.
- [10] S. H. B. Harmadi, U. Suchaini, and A. Adji, "Indonesia's Village Development Indicator: In Terms of Mismatch of Village Measurement Indicator," TNP2K Working Paper 51-e, 2020.
- [11] Pemerintah Kabupaten Purwakarta, *Peraturan Bupati Purwakarta Nomor 70A tahun 2015 tentang Desa Berbudaya*. 2015.
- [12] I. Permatasari and K. A. Hakam, "The Development of Character Education Based on Sundanese Local Wisdom," *IOP Conf. Ser. Earth Environ. Sci.*, vol. 145, no. 1, 2018, doi: 10.1088/1755-1315/145/1/012124.
- [13] Pemerintah Provinsi Bali, *Peraturan Daerah Provinsi Bali Nomor 4 Tahun 2019 tentang Desa Adat di Bali*. 2019.
- [14] G. A. M. Suartika and K. E. Saputra, "The Creation of Harmonious Living Spheres - Landscape, Capital, and the Balinese Way," *IOP Conf. Ser. Earth Environ. Sci.*, vol. 248, no. 1, 2019, doi: 10.1088/1755-1315/248/1/012065.
- [15] Pemerintah Provinsi Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta, *Peraturan Gubernur Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta Nomor 25 Tahun 2019 tentang Pedoman Kelembagaan Urusan Keistimewaan pada Pemerintah Kabupaten/Kota dan Kalurahan*. 2019.
- [16] Z. Akbar, "Community Resilience: Lesson Learnt from Disaster Survivors in Yogyakarta Province Indonesia," *IOP Conf. Ser. Earth Environ. Sci.*, vol. 273, no. 1, 2019, doi: 10.1088/1755-1315/273/1/012036.
- [17] Pemerintah Provinsi Sumatera Barat, *Peraturan Daerah Provinsi Sumatera Barat Nomor 7 Tahun 2018 tentang Nagari*. 2018.
- [18] Y. Maputra *et al.*, "Building Family's Social Resilience through Batobo Culture: A community environment proposal," *IOP Conf. Ser. Earth Environ. Sci.*, vol. 469, no. 1, 2020, doi: 10.1088/1755-1315/469/1/012062.
- [19] B. J. Downes, F. Miller, J. Barnett, A. Glaister, and H. Ellemor, "How do we know about resilience? An analysis of empirical research on resilience, and implications for interdisciplinary praxis," *Environ. Res. Lett.*, vol. 8, no. 1, p. 014041, Mar. 2013, doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/8/1/014041.
- [20] A. Steiner and J. Atterton, "Exploring the contribution of rural enterprises to local resilience," *J. Rural Stud.*, vol. 40, pp. 30–45, Aug. 2015, doi: 10.1016/j.jrurstud.2015.05.004.

- [21] M. J. Plodinec, W. C. Edwards, and R. K. White, "Applications of a 'Whole Community' Framework for Enhancing Community or Campus Resilience," *Procedia Econ. Financ.*, vol. 18, no. September, pp. 9–16, 2014, doi: 10.1016/S2212-5671(14)00907-1.
- [22] B. Obrist, C. Pfeiffer, and R. Henley, "Multi-layered social resilience," *Prog. Dev. Stud.*, vol. 10, no. 4, pp. 283–293, Oct. 2010, doi: 10.1177/146499340901000402.
- [23] P. Bourdieu, "The Forms of Capital," in *Handbook of Theory and Research for the Sociology of Education*, J. Richardson, Ed. Westport, CT: Greenwood, 1986, pp. 241–258.