

How to Cite

Sama, I. N., Ardika, I. W., Suda, I. K., & Dhana, I. N. (2021). Mutual hegemony and showing social capital in handling conflict problems: cases of border conflict between Batubulan and Lembeng Traditional Village, Sukawati, Gianyar. *International Journal of Humanities, Literature & Arts*, 4(1), 20-28. <https://doi.org/10.31295/ijhla.v4n1.1645>

Mutual Hegemony and Showing Social Capital in Handling Conflict Problems: Cases of Border Conflict Between Batubulan and Lembeng Traditional Village, Sukawati, Gianyar

I Nyoman Sama

Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Udayana, Denpasar, Indonesia
Corresponding author email: nyoman.sama@gmail.com

I Wayan Ardika

Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Udayana, Denpasar, Indonesia

I Ketut Suda

Universitas Hindu Indonesia, Denpasar, Indonesia

I Nyoman Dhana

Faculty of Humanities, Universitas Udayana, Denpasar, Indonesia

Abstract---This paper aims to provide an overview of how the efforts for mutual hegemony and social capital performance are carried out by each conflicting party. This is done by highlighting the discourses raised by each conflicting party. For this reason, there are four theories referred to deconstruction theory, hegemony theory, power and knowledge theory, and communicative action theory. The research method applied is qualitative. Data was collected employing observation, in-depth interviews, and documentation techniques. Data analysis was carried out interpretively and deconstructively. The results of the research regarding the efforts of mutual hegemony and counter-hegemony as well as the performance of social capital above can be concluded as follows. 1) Efforts for mutual hegemony and counter-hegemony between parties involved in the border conflict are full of efforts to pressure each other and point out the mistakes of the opposing party. 2) The purpose of hegemony and counter-hegemony as well as the show of social capital is for the opposing party to follow the will behind the hegemony, counter-hegemony, and show social capital, namely accepting the claim. 3) Considering that each party remains adamant on its claims and mutually hegemony.

Keywords---boundaries, conflict, culture, hegemony, social capital.

Introduction

As the title suggests, this research examines the phenomenon of power relations behind the border conflict between Batubulan Village and Lembeng Traditional Village, in Gianyar Regency, Bali. The existence of these conflict events can be identified by observing the news published by the Bali Post, February 28, 2011, entitled "Seize the Boundary, Two Tensioned Villages". The news stated as follows. "Two masses, each from Ketewel Village and Batubulan Village, Sukawati District, Gianyar, argued the village boundary case, Sunday (27/2) yesterday afternoon. Around 150 Ketewel residents dressed in traditional clothes carrying mutual assistance facilities packed the border area of the two areas which are currently being contested. On one side, the mass from Batubulan was about 50 people and village officials were also at the location wanting to put up a boundary sign." Concerning the above news, a note from the Gianyar Resort Police dated 27 June 2011 states as follows. "The boundary issue between the Lembeng Traditional Village, Ketewel Village, and Batubulan Village. The conflict was triggered by the installation

of the Lembeng Beach sign which led to the mass mobilization of both parties.” Based on this information, it can be said that the village boundary conflict occurred between the people of Batubulan Village and the people of the Lembeng Traditional Village.

Viewed from the point of view of local Balinese wisdom, the conflict between the Batubulan Village community and the Lembeng Indigenous Village community is a reality or reality, which should or ideally not have to happen. It is said that because the Balinese, including the people in conflict, have concepts that are the local wisdom of the Balinese people which are full of the values of social harmony, tolerance values, and social solidarity values. These concepts include the concept of *tri hita karana*, the concept of *Sagilik Saguluk*, *Paras Paros Sarpanaya*, *Salunglung Subbayantaka*. If this concept is implemented, social harmony in Balinese society, including in the relationship between the Batubulan Village community and the Lembeng Indigenous Village community can certainly be realized. By referring to the idea of [Mantra & Sukawati \(1993\)](#) that the development of Balinese culture will not deviate from these concepts, then the Balinese should be able to prevent conflict problems as well as the border conflict between Batubulan Village and Lembeng Traditional Village.

According to information from the Batubulan Village and the Lembeng Traditional Village, the conflict was about a rice field area which in the Batubulan Village map appears to be part of the Batubulan Village area. However, according to information provided by the Head of Batubulan Village I Dewa Gde Oka stated that the Lembeng Traditional Village community claimed the rice fields were part of their village area. By referring to Foucault's thoughts, the power relation in the relationship between the Batubulan Village community and the Lembeng Indigenous Village community with the nuances of border conflict is interesting to study through in-depth research. Interestingly, this is also investigated because the conflict has been going on for so long, namely since 2001 but has not yet been completed. In addition, the conflict occurred in the context of the struggle for a subak area which of course never shifted its location from the start, but then instead there were mutual claims by two parties who both claimed the subak area as part of their village territory. In building the justification for their claim, each party has mutual hegemony and shows their social capital. Based on the facts above, this paper wants to describe the efforts of mutual hegemony and the performance of social capital ([Ishihara & Pascual, 2009](#); [Burt, 2000](#)).

Method

The data used in this paper were obtained through field research by referring to the theory of hegemony (Gramsci), Foucault's theory of power and knowledge, and the theory of communicative action (Habermas). As stated by [Barker \(2014\)](#), that according to the theory of hegemony, there is a bundle of meanings in any culture that can be called "ruling" meanings. This process of creating, maintaining, maintaining, and producing a set of authoritative meanings, ideologies, and practices is called hegemony. Meanwhile, [Barker \(2014\)](#) asserts that according to the theory of power and knowledge popularized by Foucault, truth and knowledge are human products that are socially shaped and specific in a certain space-time. The theory of communicative action popularized by Habermas ([Thompson, 2014](#)) describes communicative action as action-oriented to achieving understanding. Communicative action occurs when actors are oriented to reach understanding with other actors through a cooperative discussion process, as well as their actions are coordinated through a collective agreement which becomes conditions to come up with a common plan.

The research method applied is qualitative. Data was collected employing observation, in-depth interviews, and documentation techniques. Data analysis was carried out interpretively and deconstructively by referring to the steps of the deconstruction methodology which according to [Lubis \(2014\)](#) is common in the application of deconstruction, namely critical reading by searching for paradoxes and contradictions in the text. This reading tries to fight the text so that it is possible to give birth to a new meaning of the text. It can also show the difference between what is stated and what is not, which was popularized by Foucault.

Results and Discussion

Hegemony and counter hegemony between Batubulan and Lembeng traditional village parties

As already stated, according to [Barker \(2014\)](#), hegemony is the process of creating, maintaining, maintaining, and producing a set of authoritative meanings, ideologies, and practices. Power relations in the border conflict between Batubulan Village and Lembeng Traditional Village appear to be full of discourses from each of the conflicting parties. The discourse of each party shows the implications of the border conflict, among others, in the form of hegemony and counter-hegemony between the two. This can be seen, among others, from the discourse in the form of a letter from the Batubulan Village Head to the Sukawati District Head dated July 5, 2000, a copy of which was

submitted to the Lembeng Traditional Village, so that the Lembeng Traditional Village responded by writing a letter to the Sukawati District Head dated 22 January 2001, a copy of which was also sent to the Head of the Village. Batubulan village (Musavengane & Kloppers, 2020; Sommerfeldt, 2013). Although the text of the letter from the Batubulan Village Head was not found, from the response of the Lembeng Traditional Village it was known that what was in question was the boundary between the two villages. This can be understood by looking at the letter from the Lembeng Traditional Village. The opening part of the letter from the Lembeng Traditional Village is stated as follows.

“...After studying the letter from the village head of Batubulan No. 100/959/Pem./2000 dated July 5, 2000, which was submitted to you and a copy of which was submitted to us, we hereby convey the response which is the result of the Prajuru and Saba of the Lembeng Traditional Village on Sunday, 10 December and Sunday 14 January 2001 as follows.”.

This quote shows that it is true that a copy of the letter from the village head of Batubulan to the sub-district head of Sukawati (in the text called Mr.), dated July 5, 2000, was sent to the Lembeng Traditional Village. Submission of a copy of the letter to the Lembeng Traditional Village can be seen as an effort to the hegemony of the Batubulan Village Head to the Lembeng Traditional Village (Unerman & Bennett, 2004; Muradian et al., 2012). This means that the delivery of a copy of the letter is done so that the Lembeng Traditional Village knows, understands, and follows the wishes of the Batubulan Village, that the Subak Biyaung Gianyar area is the Batubulan Village area. Therefore, the Lembeng Traditional Village should not insist on claiming the subak area as part of the Lembeng Traditional Village area. The submission of the Batubulan Village Head's letter to the Sukawati Sub-district can be seen as a step considered strategic by the Batubulan Village Head to hegemony/dominate the Lembeng Traditional Village. This step also reflects the belief of the Batubulan Village Head that this step will be more effective than other steps, for example by submitting a letter of objection directly to the Lembeng Traditional Village. It turned out that the efforts of Batubulan Village's hegemony described above did not work. This can be seen from the response from the Lembeng Traditional Village which can be seen as a counter-hegemony. This can be seen from the statement of the Lembeng Traditional Village as follows.

"That the object which is the wewidangan of the Lembeng Traditional Village that we made the subject of discussion is Palemahan Subak Babakan (Subak Biyaung Ginyar) which is located south of the Candra Asri Batubulan Housing, hereinafter we will call it Subak Biyaung Gianyar which is now developing into a settlement".

Indeed, this statement is not straightforward but reflects an opinion related to the issue of village boundaries, that the Biyaung subak area is not part of the Batubulan Village area. This can be seen from the statement in the quote above that "Palemahan Subak Babakan (Subak Biyaung Ginyar) is located south of Candra Asri Batubulan Housing". This means that the subak (palemahan) area contested in the boundary conflict is not located or is not located in the Batubulan Village area, but to the south of Batubulan Village. Thus, it can be understood that the text excerpt above shows implications (summaries, conclusions, and suggestions but not stated explicitly) in the form of a counter-hegemony from the Lembeng Traditional Village towards hegemony efforts as reflected in the letter from the Batubulan Village Head. The counter-hegemony was constructed through two meetings (paruman) of the management of the Lembeng Traditional Village. It seems that the confirmation of this in the letter from the Lembeng Traditional Village to the Sukawati Sub-district Head is not without meaning, but has a specific purpose. It could be that the intention was to emphasize that the response to the letter from the Batubulan Village Head, a copy of which was submitted to the Lembeng Traditional Village, was not a response from the Lembeng Traditional Village Head (Bendesa Adat), but was a response by all the traditional village administrators. So the Lembeng Traditional Village party thus wanted to show the power behind their response, namely the power of the Lembeng Traditional Village management apparatus in protecting their village territory (Martin & Siehl, 1983; Cooper, 2000; Pawlak, 2005).

It seems that the contents of the letter from the Head of Batubulan Village to the Sukawati Sub-district, dated July 5, 2000, confirm that there is a map used as a reference to claim the Subak Biyaung Gianyar area as part of the Batubulan Village area. So in this case the map will be used as a tool of hegemony against the Lembeng Traditional Village. This can be seen from the efforts to counter-hegemony by the Lembeng Traditional Village through a statement in his letter to the Sukawati sub-district head, as follows.

"Regarding the area boundary that refers to the natural boundary that we can accept is the natural boundary of Telabah Subak Biyaung Gianyar which limits Palemahan Subak Biyaung Gianyar with Candra Asri Batubulan Housing,"

Not a map, but a natural boundary in the form of a water channel (telabah) which is used as a reference in determining the location of the Subak area, not in the Batubulan Village area, but the water channel that limits the Batubulan Village area with the Subak Costung Gianyar area. So in this case, the natural boundary sign in the form of a water channel is used as a counter-hegemony tool by the Lembeng Traditional Village. This counter-hegemony seems to be strengthened by the following statement.

"Regarding the map reference, in our opinion, the application of maps in the field should be following the facts and the geographical history of Palemahan concerned. Whereas based on historical factors and the results of our hearings with Pekaseh and residents of Subak Biyaung Gianyar, we can explain that all lands in Palemahan, Subak Biyaung Gianyar have been tilled by the residents of Ketewel Village, especially the residents of the Lembeng Traditional Village, until now and have not been used for generations. was once part of the Batubulan Village Area".

This text implies that the Lembeng Traditional Village wants to strengthen its hegemony over the Batubulan Village by highlighting the legitimacy of their claim to the Subak Biyaung Gianyar area as part of their village territory. This legitimacy is supported by the statement that the legitimacy is based on the approval of the head and residents of Subak Biyaung Gianyar. This legitimacy will be strengthened again by making a statement referring to UUPA no. 5 of 1960 concerning Land reform as follows. "Based on UUPA No. 5 of 1960, especially regarding land reform, all land in Palemahan, Subak Biyaung, Gianyar, became the property of the cultivators, namely the residents of Ketewel Village, especially the Lembeng Traditional Villagers. This can happen because it cannot be separated from the historical factor of cultivating the land which is recognized as the basis by the BAL/Land reform".

This text shows that the Lembeng Traditional Village wants to make UUPA no. 5 of 1960 concerning Land reform as a means of legitimizing his statement in the plan to hegemony the Batubulan Village. However, if one looks closely, the statement or text is not very strong because the LoGA does not legitimize territorial status or territorial boundaries, but legitimizes ownership of land in the Subak Biyaung Gianyar area. So it seems that the logic behind the hegemonic efforts of the Lembeng Traditional Village is not strong enough. The lack of strength of this logic is even more evident with the statement in the text above that "it can happen because it cannot be separated from the historical factor of cultivating the land which is recognized as the basis by the UUPA/Land reform". Underlining the word "can happen", it can be said that the text above does not contain certainty so that it is not strong enough to be used as a tool of hegemony (Karriem, 2009; Peter, 2015; Pratiwi et al., 2019).

Although various hegemony efforts have been carried out as described above, it seems that the Lembeng Traditional Village still feels the need to continue to strengthen its hegemony against the Batubulan Village. It seems that there is still a statement from the Lembeng Traditional Village that leads to the hegemony effort. In this case, his statement is based on the location of the establishment of two temples which are managed by the people of Ketewel Village, including the residents of the Lembeng Traditional Village. His statement is as follows.

"As the area of Ketewel Village, in Palemahan Subak Biyaung, two temples have been built since a long time ago, namely the Hyang Sangkur Temple and the Taman Sari Temple which were carried out by the residents of Ketewel Village, not for cultivating the land".

One of the temples mentioned in this text is Hyang Sangkur Temple whose physical form is as shown in Figure 1.



Figure 1. Hyang Sangkur Temple front view located in the Subak Biyaung area of Gianyar
Source: Document I Nyoman Sama, dated 10 May 2016

Regarding the contents of this text, there is information obtained in the field, that the two temples mentioned in this text are indeed managed by the residents of Ketewel Village only, the Batubulan Village does not take care of the temple. Although it is not stated, the text above implies something that is summarized (implicated) in it, namely the intention of the Lembeng Traditional Village in presenting this text. What this means is that it is logically impossible for a temple to be built outside the village area which is the home village of the community members who manage the temple. At first glance, this logic seems logical or makes sense, but when compared to temple administrators in various areas in Bali, it seems that it is not always a temple built in the village area of the owner or administrator. Thus, besides being logical, there are also nuances of illogicality.

Even so, the discourse of the Lembeng Traditional Village which relies on the location of the temple's establishment seems relatively strong, because the people of Batubulan Village do not take care of the temple. Therefore, it is not surprising that the Batubulan Village did not use the temple as a material in building discourse to hegemony the Lembeng Traditional Village. The next attempt at the hegemony of the Lembeng Traditional Village to the Batubulan Village was carried out by making a statement relating to their role in road widening. His full statement is as follows.

"Regarding the widening of the road from the Candra Asri Housing to Lembeng Beach which is being carried out by AMD is proof of the enormous sacrifice of the residents of the Lembeng Traditional Village, especially the landowners on the left and right of the road who with full awareness have donated their land without receiving compensation for widening The road which was originally a footpath with a width of 1 (one) meter has now become a road with a width of 6 (six) meters. We don't have a problem with this road because it is a public road that can be used by anyone, even though we Krama Desa Adat Lembeng every year before the Melasti Tawur Kesanga ceremony work together to repair it".

This statement seems to highlight the sacrifices of the residents of the Lembeng Traditional Village who have donated their land to widen the road to the beach. The road is indeed located in the Subak Biyaung area which can be passed by the general public. The road in question is as shown in Figure 2.



Figure 2. Jalan Segara Lembeng road to the beach
Source: Document I Nyoman Sama, dated 10 May 2016

It seems that this protrusion was carried out to hegemony the Batubulan Village so that the Lembeng Traditional Village's claim to the Subak Biyaung Gianyar area as part of the customary village area was not disputed.

Political games show social capital

One thing that appears as an implication of the boundary conflict between Batubulan Village and Lembeng Traditional Village is the act of mutual hegemony by showing or showing capital in the form of social relations and/or social strengths possessed by each of the conflicting parties. This is what Foucault popularized as a political game to show social capital. This political game is seen in the participation or involvement of certain parties in constructing the hegemony package by each of these parties. The political game of showing social capital that appeared earlier in the conflict process in this case was shown by the Lembeng Traditional Village. This was done by stating that the statement used to respond to the attitude of the Batubulan Village was the result of a meeting involving all members of the Lembeng Traditional Village Management and members of an institution called Saba Desa Adat Lembeng (a kind of MPR, if at the state level). In full, his statement is as follows.

“After studying the letter from the village head of Batubulan no. which was conveyed to you and a copy of which was submitted to us, we hereby convey the response which is the result of the Prajuru and Saba of the Lembeng Traditional Village on Sunday, 10 December and Sunday 14 January 2001 as follows.”.

Although the meeting was held with the involvement of the administrators of the two institutions as mentioned in the text above, it turned out that the letter containing the decision of the meeting was signed by three heads of institutions. The three leaders of the institution are the Bendesa Adat Lembeng, Klian Saba, Desa Adat Lembeng, and the Head of Ketewel Village. This can be seen in full at the end of the letter, which is as follows. 'Based on the descriptions above, we can conclude that de facto and de jure Palemahan Subak Biyaung Gianyar is the wewidangan of the Lembeng Traditional Village, Ketewel Village. What limits it to Candra Asri's housing, Batubulan is the natural boundary of Telabah Subak Biyaung Gianyar'

Kelihan Saba Desa Adat Lembeng
I Wayan Gupuh Sudhiarta

Bendesa Adat Lembeng
I Wayan Mura

Knowing
 Head of Ketewel Village
 I Wayan Teko

Copy of the letter was delivered to
 Dear. Head of Batubulan Village

The appearance of the Ketewel Village Head in this letter can be seen as a sign of an effort to show greater social capital. Indeed, the letter was addressed to the Sukawati sub-district head, but a copy was sent to the village head of Batubulan. Thus, the political game of showing social capital through the letter was aimed primarily at the Batubulan Village which did not agree with the claims of the Lembeng Traditional Village over the Subak Biyaung Gianyar area as part of the Lembeng Traditional Village area. The political game to show social capital that was displayed by the Lembeng Traditional Village as described above turned out to be a response from the Batubulan Village by showing the political game of showing social capital as well. This can be seen from the documents resulting from the meeting involving many figures from Batubulan Village which were then submitted by letter to the Regent of Gianyar. This can be observed at the end of the document resulting from the meeting in the form of a statement of attitude, as follows. "Attitude Statement". Based on the description above, we Batubulan community are determined to ask the government of Gianyar to include a decision to clarify the determination of the Subak Biaung area as the Batubulan Village area. Thus this statement is for all parties to understand.

Batubulan, November 25, 2001
 Head of Batubulan Village
 I Dewa Made Oka Merta

Head of LMD
 Government Sector
 Drs. I Dewa Putu Muka

Development Sector
 Drs. I W Ramantha, AK MM

Social Affairs
 Drs. I Dewa Gede Bagus Badra

Head of LKMD
 I Wayan Suranadi, S.E

Bendesa Adat Tegaltamu
 I Ketut Rote Adhi

Bendesa Adat Jero Kuta
 I Nyoman Yudha

Bendesa Adat Delod Tukad
 I Dewa Nyoman Bajra

Pekaseh Gede
 I Made Lotring

Public figure
 Tjokorda Gde Agung
 Drs. I Wayan Geriya
 I Dewa Nyoman Rai Adnyana
 Drs. I Gusti Ngurah Narakusuma
 Gusti Made Raka, S.ip

Apart from the Batubulan Village Head, there are 13 people whose names are listed in the above document. This means that there were 14 people involved in the meeting which resulted in a statement that they still claimed the Subak Biyaung area as part of the Batubulan Village area. In terms of numbers, this appears to be greater than the number of people who signed the letter from the Lembeng Traditional Village to the Sukawati sub-district head as shown above. In addition to being more numerous, they consist of various fields within the organizational structure of Batubulan Village, both as an official village and traditional villages in Batubulan. Thus, it can be said that both quantitatively and qualitatively, the social capital of the Batubulan Village that was displayed was greater than the social capital of the Lembeng Traditional Village which was also displayed by letter.

Even so, the greater social capital of the Batubulan Village did not stop the political game of social capital displayed by the Lembeng Traditional Village. Although the letter from the Batubulan Village to the Gianyar Regent showing the names of the 14 figures was not sent to the Lembeng Traditional Village, it turned out that after that a document appeared entitled "Letter of Joint Statement" dated January 4, 2003, which was signed by 67 people who called themselves villagers. Lembeng adat, especially those who are owners and former owners of rice fields in the Subak Biyaung Gianyar area, Ketewel Village. Based on various reasons, they declared themselves to maintain the Subak Biyaung Gianyar area as part of the Lembeng Traditional Village area, Ketewel Village. This can be seen in full at the end of the document, as follows. "Based on the statement above, we hereby state the following attitude:

- Refuse the Subak Biaung Gianyar area to be made into the Batubulan Village area".
- Keeping the Subak Biaung Gianyar area as a guide for the weakening of the Lembeng Traditional Village, Ketewel Village together with all levels of society in the Lembeng Traditional Village".
- Expecting the competent authorities to immediately resolve the problem properly". Thus, we make this statement with full awareness and a sense of responsibility without any coercion by anyone and we signed it together witnessed by the Bendesa Indigenous Lembeng and Perbekel Desa Ketewel".

In the document, it appears that 67 people have signed, so that in terms of quantity it can be seen as a large social capital as well. Meanwhile, the names and signatures of the Lembeng Indigenous Bendesa and the Ketewel Village Perbekel are listed as witnesses on the letter complete with their respective stamps. Indeed, there is no explicit statement in the joint statement regarding the purpose of its manufacture. However, judging from point 5.3 in the joint statement, namely "Hopefully the authorities will immediately resolve the problem properly", it can be seen that the statement letter is addressed to the Gianyar Regency government as a representation of the competent authorities in the context of resolving the issue of the poaching conflict. the boundary between the Lembeng Traditional Village and Batubulan Village.

Observing the status of the members of this joint statement-making group, it seems that something is interesting to respond to because with their status it seems that they are not strong enough to claim the Subak Biyaung Gianyar area as part of the Lembeng Traditional Village area. As emphasized above, they call themselves made up of owners and former owners of land in the subak area. This means that the former owners are no longer the owners of the land in the subak area, and thus they are only a part of the entire rice field owners in the subak area, so they are not strong enough to claim the entire subak area as part of the village area. Lembeng custom. So from their total number of 67 people, several people are not landowners in the subak area. Let alone not the owner, the landowner in the subak area does not seem to have the authority to determine that the subak area is part of the territory of a village, including the Lembeng Traditional Village.

Conclusion

Based on the explanation of the efforts of mutual hegemony and counter-hegemony above and the performance of social capital above, it can be concluded as follows.

- Efforts for mutual hegemony and counter-hegemony between parties involved in the border conflict between Batubulan Village and Lembeng Traditional Village are full of efforts to pressure each other and point out the mistakes of the opposing party.
- The purpose of hegemony and counter-hegemony as well as the demonstration of social capital is for the opposing party to follow the will behind the hegemony, counter-hegemony, and show social capital, namely accepting claims to the Subak Biyaung Gianyar area as part of their village territory.

- Considering that each party remains adamant on its claims and mutually hegemony, it shows that the relationship between the conflicting parties is confrontational. In such circumstances, the problem of the village boundary conflict has never been resolved until now.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to two anonymous reviewers for their valuable comments on the earlier version of this paper.

References

- Barker, C. (2014). Cultural Studies Dictionary (Translator: B. Hendar Putranto). *Kanisius Publisher, Yogyakarta*.
- Burt, R. S. (2000). The network structure of social capital. *Research in organizational behavior*, 22, 345-423. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085\(00\)22009-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0191-3085(00)22009-1)
- Cooper, M. D. (2000). Towards a model of safety culture. *Safety science*, 36(2), 111-136. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-7535\(00\)00035-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0925-7535(00)00035-7)
- Ishihara, H., & Pascual, U. (2009). Social capital in community level environmental governance: A critique. *Ecological Economics*, 68(5), 1549-1562. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ecolecon.2008.11.003>
- Karriem, A. (2009). The rise and transformation of the Brazilian landless movement into a counter-hegemonic political actor: A Gramscian analysis. *Geoforum*, 40(3), 316-325. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2008.10.005>
- Lubis, AY (2014). Postmodernism: Theory and Method. Jakarta.
- Mantra, IB, & Sukawati, S. (1993). *Bali: socio-cultural issues and modernization*. Upasada Literature.
- Martin, J., & Siehl, C. (1983). Organizational culture and counterculture: An uneasy symbiosis. *Organizational dynamics*, 12(2), 52-64. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616\(83\)90033-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/0090-2616(83)90033-5)
- Muradian, R., Walter, M., & Martinez-Alier, J. (2012). Hegemonic transitions and global shifts in social metabolism: Implications for resource-rich countries. Introduction to the special section. *Global environmental change*, 22(3), 559-567. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2012.03.004>
- Musavengane, R., & Kloppers, R. (2020). Social capital: An investment towards community resilience in the collaborative natural resources management of community-based tourism schemes. *Tourism Management Perspectives*, 34, 100654. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tmp.2020.100654>
- Pawlak, Z. (2005). Some remarks on conflict analysis. *European Journal of Operational Research*, 166(3), 649-654. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ejor.2003.09.038>
- Peter, V. F. (2015). Relationship among culture, education and sports. *International research journal of management, IT and social sciences*, 2(11), 38-42.
- Pratiwi, I. Y., Ratnadi, N. M. D., Suprasto, H. B., & Sujana, I. K. (2019). The effect of role conflict, role ambiguity, and role overload in burnout government internal supervisors with tri hita karana culture as moderation. *International Research Journal of Management, IT and Social Sciences*, 6(3), 61-69.
- Sommerfeldt, E. J. (2013). The civility of social capital: Public relations in the public sphere, civil society, and democracy. *Public Relations Review*, 39(4), 280-289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pubrev.2012.12.004>
- Thompson, JB (2014). Analysis of World Ideologies: A Discourse Critique of World Ideologies. *Yogyakarta: Divapress*.
- Unerman, J., & Bennett, M. (2004). Increased stakeholder dialogue and the internet: towards greater corporate accountability or reinforcing capitalist hegemony?. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 29(7), 685-707. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.aos.2003.10.009>