

The Decadence of Gotong Royong

Nicholas Simarmata
Doctoral Student of Psychology Department
Gadjah Mada University
Yogyakarta, Indonesia
nicholas.simarmata@mail.ugm.ac.id

Bagus Riyono
Lecturer of Psychology Department
Gadjah Mada University
Yogyakarta, Indonesia
bagus@ugm.ac.id

Kwartarini Wahyu Yuniarti
Lecturer of Psychology Department
Gadjah Mada University
Yogyakarta, Indonesia
kwartarini_psy@ugm.ac.id

Bhina Patria
Lecturer of Psychology Department
Gadjah Mada University
Yogyakarta, Indonesia
patria@ugm.ac.id

Abstract—*Gotong royong* as a culture value and Indonesian identity becomes very vital and important for this nation and country. This statement is strengthened in the Opening of The 1945 State Constitution (Pembukaan Undang-Undang Dasar) of the Republic Indonesia in the Fourth Paragraph in which the core is that Indonesia will be able to achieve the great mission if the society applies *gotong royong*. However, in its development, *gotong royong* experiences decadence in understanding the meaning and its implementation, so that the prevention strategy is highly needed. One of the strategies offered by the researchers is using Social Capital. Thus, it is important to explore further about the roles of Social Capital toward *gotong royong*. This study is a library study using references in a form of books and journals, both online and printed forms. The result of this study is that Social Capital can be one of the solutions for the problem in this research, in which *gotong royong* itself is a social capital for Indonesian people. Therefore, it can be concluded that Indonesia needs to have the renewed understanding and to realize that by *gotong royong*, Indonesia can be a developed nation since *gotong royong* itself is a very vital and important social capital for Indonesian nation and country.

Keywords—*gotong royong*, indonesia, decadence, social capital

I. INTRODUCTION

Indonesia was established on August 17th, 1945, and since that day, Indonesia has been expected to be a developing, developed, and strong country. To achieve these goals, the strategy is mentioned in the Second Paragraph of The 1945 State Constitution (Undang-Undang Dasar) of the Republic Indonesia that is stated as below (Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 17 Tahun 2007 Tentang Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Panjang Nasional Tahun 2005–2025).

"Whereas the struggle of the Indonesian independence movement has reached the bliss full point of leading the Indonesian people safely and well before the monumental gate of an independent Indonesian State which shall be free, united, sovereign, just, and prosperous".

While the mission is mentioned in the fourth paragraph of The State Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia of 1945 as stated below (Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 17 Tahun 2007 Tentang Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Panjang Nasional Tahun 2005–2025).

"Pursuant to which, in order to form a Government of the State of Indonesia that shall protect the whole people of Indonesia and the entire homeland of Indonesia, and in order

to advance general prosperity, to develop the nation's intellectual life, and to contribute to the implementation of a world order based on freedom, lasting peace and social justice, Indonesia's National Independence shall be laid down in a Constitution of the State of Indonesia, which is to be established as the State of the Republic of Indonesia with sovereignty of the people and based on the belief in the One and Only God, on just and civilized humanity, on the unity of Indonesia and on democratic rule that is guided by the strength of wisdom resulting from deliberation / representation, so as to realize social justice for all the people of Indonesia."

In creating those four missions, Indonesian government will be able to achieve the missions since they have the spirit of *gotong royong* (Sarwono, 2017). It is because Indonesia does *gotong royong* in order to create the united, sovereign, intelligent, and prosperous country, and to create The Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia (Negara Kesatuan Republik Indonesia) and to be able to contribute to the effort of creating universal peace and maintaining international security. This mission is based on Pancasila which was extracted and named by Soekarno (the first president of the Republic of Indonesia) as *gotong royong* (Abdillah 2011; Bowen, 1986; Dewantara, 2017; Modul Bidang Studi Pancasila dan UUD negara RI 1945, 2015; Setiawan & Zurbuchen, 2000; Simarmata, Sunaryo, Fachrurrozi, Purnama, Susanto, Nurjanah, Rizal & Sapei, 2017; Suryohadiprojo, 2016; Triwidodo, 2017; Zakaria, 2017). This means that Indonesia has a spirit and dream to become the strongest country in "Far East" so that Indonesia is called "Young Giant" that lives the value of *gotong royong* to build the nation (Bowie, 1955).

If *gotong royong* is implemented well, it will minimize the existence of problems and push Indonesia to be a great country. It is because *gotong royong* is beneficial to maintain the solidarity, harmonic life, and society's contribution (Newberry, 2007; Bowen, 1986). *Gotong royong* plays a big role in the development when the sense of society's participation and responsibility is in line with the strategy of either physical or non-physical development or based on life sectors that occur in the society (Suwondo, 1983b; Sayuti, 1983). *Gotong royong* promotes a positive value such as social harmony and gives faith needed to face difficulties and to help those who are in relation (Kobayashi & Shakaigaku, 2004). *Gotong royong* becomes a part of the development goals, the realization of nation's characters to be strong, competitive, noble, and moral based on Pancasila that was symbolized through Indonesian society's characters and behavior of being

religious, believing in the Almighty God, virtuous, tolerant, patriotic, dynamic and science-oriented (Hikam, 2014). *Gotong royong* has played a big role in developing Indonesian nation (Simarmata, Sunaryo, Fachrurrozi, Purnama, Susanto, Nurjanah, Rizal & Sapei, 2017) since *gotong royong* is one of the main factors in development strategy (Bowen 1986; Okten & Osili, 2004), development implementation (Suwondo, 1983a), and the development success (Nur, Djamil & Rahim, 1981). *Gotong royong* makes the life of Indonesian society become powerful and prosperous (Effendi, 2013).

However, *gotong royong* experiences decadence recently. It can be seen from the theoretical and empirical evidences happening. Theoretically, in this era, one of the excesses of the industrial process is how human relation is being torn apart. This can be seen through an attitude of not being care, the weakening of loving each other, and the decrease of doing *gotong royong*. The individualistic attitude of not caring other people's prosperity is the extreme side of living with society (Ancok, 2004). As liberalism and individualism developed in the society, some people has already been worried about the decreasing of the spirit of *gotong royong* in Indonesia. Modernization and liberalization of life that make people tend to pursue individualism is the main obstacle of *gotong royong* (Pranowo, 2010). In Indonesian reality, maintaining the spirit of *gotong royong* in individualistic and competitive life is considered to be very difficult. Indonesian society who has a good character and rich of local values in the plurality of *gotong royong* starts becoming a group of hegemony that compete one to another and act selfish (Fajarini, 2014; Modul Bidang Studi Kepemimpinan, 2015; Raharjo, 2010; Setiawan, 2013). The society starts leaving the values and tradition of *gotong royong* because they consider that it does not make sense so that this affects to the society's life structure. The society has become materialistic and individualist (Sugiyanto & Khamadi, 2011). The culture of materialism and modernism has dominated the life of Indonesian nation and has become the cause of the value decadence of *gotong royong* (Mustaqim, 2013). The character of *gotong royong* is scraped by individualism (Gunardo, 2013). The individualistic tendency in Indonesian society that develops recently is suspected as the cause of *gotong royong* decadence (Sularto & Paramita, 2017).

Empirically, when the value of *gotong royong* experiences decadence in national context, the National Defence (Ketahanan Nasional) of Indonesia is also decreasing as well. This phenomenon is recorded by Labkurtannas (Laboratorium Pengukuran Ketahanan Nasional - National Defence Measurement Laboratory) Lemhannas (Lembaga Ketahanan Nasional - National Security Institution) RI (the Republic of Indonesia) since 2010 (Wingarta, 2017). This means, *gotong royong* becomes one of the important parts that plays a big role in National Defence. Labkurtannas Lemhannas RI consists of Tri Gatra ("Geography", "Demography", and "Natural Resources") and Panca Gatra ("Ideology", "Politics", "Economy", "Socio-Culture", "Defense And Security") (Syahardani, 2018). Gatra Social or Pancagatra is active and dynamic. Gatra Social or Pancagatra that consists of ideology, politics, economy, socio-culture, and defence and security is the realization of people's behaviour in national which is led to maintain life sustainability and to improve life quality. Gatra Socio-Culture is developed for: (1) developing civil society, (2) creating and maintaining just, orderly, secure,

comfortable, harmonic, and dynamic social life, (3) aligning and strengthening local and traditional values to be more constructive, productive, and friendly to the modern and universal values, and (4) developing nation civilization among nations in the world. Aspects from Gatra Socio-Culture are Value Systems, Behaviour, and Artefacts, Harmony, Equality, and Welfare. Variables of the aspect of Value Systems, Behaviour, and Artefacts are Social Behaviour, Education, Health, Family, Social Harmony, Social Orderliness, Social Sickness, Civil Right, Women Empowerment, Traditional and Universal Value, Social Exclusion, Human Creation, and Science and Technology Benefits. Indicators of Social Behaviours are *Gotong royong*, Central policy on Social Behaviour, Regional Policy on Social Behaviour, Social Adaptability (Acculturation and Assimilation), Customary Institutions, Lifestyle Changes (Sistem Pengukuran Ketahanan Nasional dan Simulasi Kebijakan Publik, 2015).

In Labkurtannas Lemhannas RI, there is National Defence Index that consists of five Defence Levels which are: strategy meaning "Alert" with the index conversion of 1-1.8, strategy meaning "Warning" with the index conversion of 1.8-2.6, strategy meaning "Moderate Enough" with the index conversion of 2.6-3.4, strategy meaning "Moderate" with the index conversion of 3.4-4.2, and strategy meaning "Sustainable" with the index conversion of 4.2-5 (Profil Ketahanan Nasional Propinsi DIY, 2013). Based on this Defence Level, Gatra Socio-Culture, in which there is *Gotong Royong* Indicator, means "Warning". This can be seen through the index conversions in the national scale in the last 8 years, which are 1.97 (in 2010), 1.87 (in 2011), 1.87 (in 2012), 1.92 (in 2013), 1.91 (in 2014), 2.20 (in 2015), 2.14 (in 2016), 2.17 (in 2017), 2.25 (in 2018), and 2.49 (in 2019) (Daihani, 2016; Yuniarti, 2015; Profil Ketahanan Nasional Propinsi DIY, 2019). The definition of strategy meaning "Warning" is when the persistence and toughness of Indonesia is in a weak condition (Daihani, 2016). It is also stated that the toughness position of "Gatra Socio-Culture" is less than 20% in the national scale (Yuniarti, 2015), so if there is no significant change, the national stability will be faltering in the long phase. This condition is also called "Warning" or "Vulnerable" (Daihani, 2016).

Through the explanation above, it can be seen that *gotong royong* is important for Indonesia. Unfortunately, *gotong royong* experiences decadence in its meaning and implementation. This even gives impacts to the National Defence of Indonesia. Therefore, the solution that can answer this problem is highly required.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW

A. *Gotong Royong*

The word of "*gotong royong*" has become one vocabulary in Indonesian language. *Gotong royong* comes from Javanese language, or at least it has characteristics of Javanese language (Pranowo, 2010). *Gotong royong* is a combination of two words, which are *gotong* and *royong* (Tim Penyusun KBBI, 2002; Pranadji, 2009; Suwondo, 1982; Panjaitan, 2013; Kamsori, Santosa & Moe'is, 2007; Rochmadi, 2012; Simarmata, Sunaryo, Fachrurrozi, Purnama, Susanto, Nurjanah, Rizal & Sapei, 2017).

The word "*gotong*" means bear or bring or lift heavy things done by some people together (Panjaitan, 2013;

Indonesia Dictionary Drafting Team, 2002; Pranadji, 2009; Pranowo, 2010; Suwondo, 1982; Kamsori, Santosa & Moe'is, 2007; Rochmadi, 2012; Simarmata, Sunaryo, Fachrurrozi, Purnama, Susanto, Nurjanah, Rizal & Sapei, 2017). The word "royong" means together (Pranadji, 2009; Indonesia Dictionary Drafting Team, 2002; Suwondo, 1982; Panjaitan, 2013; Rochmadi, 2012; Simarmata, Sunaryo, Fachrurrozi, Purnama, Susanto, Nurjanah, Rizal & Sapei, 2017), has populist characteristics (Pranowo, 2010), and shows the enjoyment of the work results fairly (Kamsori, Santosa & Moe'is, 2007). So basically, *gotong royong* means bearing, lifting, or doing some things together (Bintarto, 1980; Khasanah, 2013; Koentjaraningrat, 1961; Panjaitan, 2013; Prawiroatmodjo, 1981; Rochmadi, 2012; Tashadi, Gatot & Sukirman, 1982; Pranadji, 2009; Suwondo, 1982; Panjaitan, 2013; Simarmata, Sunaryo, Fachrurrozi, Purnama, Susanto, Nurjanah, Rizal & Sapei, 2017), and enjoy the work results fairly (Kamsori, Santosa & Moe'is, 2007).

B. Social Capital

Social capital is the characteristics of social organizations, like network, norms, and beliefs that ease the coordination and teamwork to benefit one to another to get the same benefit. Social capital is a package of horizontal relationship among people, which consists of social engagement network that is defined by norms. Social capital gives contribution to collective actions by encouraging the norm of reciprocity, facilitating information flow, including the success of collaboration strategies done in the past, and acting as a blueprint for teamwork in the future (Putnam, 1993a; 2000). Social capital is defined as a capability that appears from the general belief in a society. This concept is also understood as a package of values or informal norms owned together by members from groups in which the teamwork can possibly occur. Social capital is related to norms and values that enable people to teamwork in culture since social capital forms a collective power based on values and norms (Fukuyama, 1995). Social capital is information, belief, and reciprocal norm that exist in the social network (Woolcock, 1998).

Social capital is a package of active relationship among people, which is trust, understanding and value equality, and behavior that bind members into a society in which teamwork can possibly occur. This definition emphasizes to the aspect of social relationship network tied by the ownership of information, trust, understanding each other, value equality, and supporting each other (Cohen & Prusak, 2001). Social capital is a network of teamwork among people to facilitate the need of solutions for problems they face (Brehm & Rahn, 1997). Social capital is functioning as a feature of social organizations, such as trust, norms, and network, that can increase the efficiency of the society by facilitating coordinated actions (Bjornskov & Sonderkov, 2013).

Social capital is not a capital in a general meaning as wealth or money, instead it is an asset or the real capital that is important in the society. It also includes the social capital which is goodwill, a sense of friendliness, mutual sympathy, and social relations, and close cooperation between people that create a social group (Hanifan, 1916). Social capital appears from a thought that members of a society are impossible to solve any kinds of problem they have. Togetherness and teamwork are needed from the society members to respond to every particular problem. The basic principle of social capital is that there are only those who have

social and culture values that will respect the importance of teamwork that can make them developed (Syahra, 2003).

The centre topic of a social capital can be summarized into two words : about relationships. By creating relationships with others and keeping them to last forever, people can work together to achieve any kind of work they cannot do alone. People create relationships through some network and they tend to have the same values with the other members in that network. As long as the network can be a power resource, then it can be seen as a capital. The membership of network and a package of values become the cores of social capital concept. Social capital truly gives a clear result that is positive for the network members and the community in general. Social capital has to be understood as a relational construct. This has to be understood as collectively and resources that can give access not only when a person builds a relationship with others but also when they internalize values with the group. Social capital is one way to see the relationship among people (Field, 2010).

The main idea of social capital is that a social capital has social contact values and precious assets. Network gives the base for social cohesion because it encourages people to work together with others-and not just with people they already knew directly-to obtain reciprocal benefits. That term refers to the relationship between individuals-social network, reciprocity norms, and trust that were developed through that relationship (Putnam, 2000; Woolcock, 1998).

Two things that become basic assumptions of the concept of social model is the existence of relationship network with the related norms and those support one to another. There are three important reasons why this can happen. First, the existence of social network enables coordination and communication that can build the feeling of trusting each other. Second, trust has a positive implication in people's life. This is proven by a fact that the relationship owned by people who trust each other strengthens norms about a must to help each other. Third, any kind of success achieved through teamwork in this network in the past time will encourage the teamwork sustainability in the next time. Social capital is functioning as a network, activity, or relationship that unites people together as a community based on psychological skill, norms, and beliefs, which are important for the society. Social capital can be used as a resource to build mutual cooperation. Social capital is placed in the growth of the tendency in a group to socialize the important parts attached in the values (Putnam, 1993b).

Social capital has some elements that become the resources for people. Some elements of social capital are trust, reciprocal values and norms, and network. The source of social capital is local value that accommodates common interests, habits, or traditions. The power of social capital can be a lubricant that makes relationships and cooperation run smoothly. Social capital becomes a positive energy and people power that is based on its characteristics and substances which are trust, norms, and network that cannot be separated from one to another, where the result is in a form of responsibility, care, honesty, cooperation, inclusiveness, trusting each other, solidarity, transparency, a feeling of safe and comfortable, even a positive work ethic (Abdullah, 2013). Social capital plays a big role in strengthening people's life. The relationship and interaction that occur will result a social capital with inner

bond, trust, and feeling of security to achieve a certain goal (Rofiana, 2016).

III. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Gotong royong is a modality (Braithwaite, 2014) and a base of social capital at once (Beard, 2007). Therefore, *gotong royong* is a social capital that is understood as a teamwork inside and between social network (Kusumasari & Alam, 2012), a social capital for people to solve problems (Gunardo, 2013), a tough social capital to maintain the function, prosperity, and life sustainability of people (Novianty, 2011), a social capital to form institution power in the level of community, society, country, and the community across Indonesian nation in creating prosperity (Koentjaraningrat, 1988; Pranadji, 2009), and a social capital in the level of community, cross community, cross country and society, and in international community in the process of developing shared welfare (Simarmata, Sunaryo, Fachrurrozi, Purnama, Susanto, Nurjanah, Rizal & Sapei, 2017). Therefore, *gotong royong* is a social capital that is strong (Chua & Ng, 2015) and principal (Bachrein, 2010; Titisari, Triwinarto & Suryasari, 2012; Titisari, Triwinarto & Suryasari, 2012). Theoretically and empirically, *gotong royong* is also admitted to be a social capital in developing people and in solving problems in a society, whether it is about politics, economy, defense, social, and culture since it has already been a traditional value of the society (Rochmadi, 2012).

Besides, *gotong royong* is a local value that is revitalized and used for social capital by society (Zaumseil, Schwarz, Von Vacano, Sullivan & Prawitasari-hadiyono, 2014). *Gotong royong* is easily found in a community that inherits substantial social capital in a form of regulations, reciprocal exchange, and a community agreement network (Asnudin, 2010; Putnam, 1993b). *Gotong royong* can also be understood in a context of people empowerment since it can be a social capital to create institutional strength in the level of community, people of the country, and the community across the nation and country of Indonesia in creating prosperity (Pranadji, 2009; Pattiradjawane & Soebagjo, 2015). In *gotong royong*, the value of social capital that is needed for the development and people's prosperity is attached (Effendi, 2013).

Social capital and *gotong royong* can grow and develop into a social energy of movement in strengthening social cohesion. Paying attention to the principles contained in *gotong royong*, aspects in social capital can be clearly seen there (Effendi, 2013). The potential of social capital is values and norms that can be a medium to set common interests and the spirit of *gotong royong* (Abdullah, 2013). Therefore, through the explanation previously, it shows that the theory of social capital is used to determine *gotong royong*. The existence of this culture base needs to be clarified back to the reality to get the suitable theories that fit the base culture.

In Indonesia, local values and social capital are abundant. Every ethnic group has its own uniqueness and social capital based on their own culture background (Prawitasari, 2016). Hence, it can be concluded that *gotong royong* is very vital and important for Indonesian nation. However, in its implementation, difficult obstacles and challenges are sometimes found, such as the decadence of meaning and implementation. Thus, one of the ways that can be done to solve this problem is by using social capital that has been

owned by Indonesian people. The word "using" here means that Indonesia has to realize that *gotong royong* itself is a social capital. Therefore, finally, Indonesian nation and state must really understand and implement the social capital at once which is very important and beneficial for Indonesia, which is *gotong royong* itself.

REFERENCES

- [1] Abdillah, B. (2011). *Gotong Royong Cermin Budaya Bangsa Dalam Arus Globalisasi*. Sekolah Tinggi Manajemen Informatika dan Komputer. AMIKOM. Yogyakarta.
- [2] Abdullah, S. (2013). Potensi Dan Kekuatan Modal Sosial Dalam Suatu Komunitas. *SOCIUS*, Volume XII. Halaman 15-21.
- [3] Ancok, D. (2004). *Psikologi Terapan: Mengupas dinamika kehidupan umat manusia*. Yogyakarta: Penerbit Darussalam.
- [4] Asnudin, A. (2010). Pendekatan Partisipatif Dalam Pembangunan Proyek Infrastruktur Perdesaan Di Indonesia. *Jurnal SMARTek*. Vol. 8. No. 3. Agustus, Halaman 182–190.
- [5] Bachrein, S. (2010). Pendekatan desa membangun di Jawa Barat: strategi dan kebijakan pembangunan pedesaan. Analisis kebijakan pertanian. Volume 8. No. 2. Juni, Halaman 133-149.
- [6] Beard, V.A. (2007). Household Contributions to Community Development in Indonesia. *World Development*. Vol. 35. No. 4, Halaman 607–625.
- [7] Bintarto, R. (1980). *Gotong Royong: Suatu Karakteristik Bangsa*. Surabaya: Bina Ilmu.
- [8] Bjornskov, C., & Sonderkov, K. M. (2013). Is social capital a good concept? Social indicator research. Volume 114. Halaman 1225-1242.
- [9] Bowen, J. R. (1986). On the Political Construction of Tradition: Gotong Royong in Indonesia. *The Journal of Asian Studies*, Vol. 45. No. 3, Halaman 545-561.
- [10] Bowie, B. M. (1955). Sang raksasa muda: INDONESIA. *National Geographic*. Volume 108. Nomor 3, Halaman 22-41.
- [11] Braithwaite, J. (2014). Traditional Justice. In J.J. Llewellyn & D. Philpott (Editors). *Restorative Justice, Reconciliation, and Peacebuilding*. Published to Oxford Scholarship Online. ISBN-13: 9780199364862. DOI:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199364862.001.0001.
- [12] Chua, V. & Ng, I.Y.H. (2015). Unequal returns to social capital: the study of Malays in Singapore through a network lens. *Asian Ethnicity*. Vol. 16, No. 4, Halaman 480–497.
- [13] Cohen, D. & Prusak, L. (2001). *In Good Company*, Boston: Harvard Business School Press.
- [14] Daihani, D.U. (2016). Pengembangan Sistem Pengukuran Ketahanan Nasional dan Simulasi Kebijakan Publik Berbasis GIS. *Laboratorium Pengukuran Ketahanan Nasional Lemhannas RI*.
- [15] Dewantara, A.W. (2017). Alangkah Hebatnya Negara Gotong Royong: Indonesia dalam Kacamata Soekarno. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- [16] Effendi, T.N. (2013). Budaya Gotong-Royong Masyarakat dalam Perubahan Sosial Saat Ini. *Jurnal Pemikiran Sosiologi*. Volume 2. No.1. Halaman 1-18.
- [17] Fajarini, U. (2014). Peranan Kearifan Lokal Dalam Pendidikan Karakter. *Sosio Didaktika*. Vol. 1. No. 2. Halaman 123-130.
- [18] Field, J. (2010). *Modal Sosial*. Penerjemah: Nurhadi. Yogyakarta: Kreasi Wacana. ISBN: 978-602-8784-01-6.
- [19] Fukuyama, F. (1995). *Trust: The Social Virtues and the Creation of Prosperity*. New York: Free Press. ISBN 0684825252.
- [20] Gunardo, R. B. (2013). Karakter Gotong Royong Warga Dalam Menghadapi Bencana Banjir Lahar Dingin Merapi Di Kota Yogyakarta. *Jurnal Penelitian Humaniora*, Vol. 18, No. 2, Oktober, Halaman 156-165.
- [21] Hanifan, L.J. (1916). The Rural School Community Center. *Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*. Volume 67. Halaman 130-138.
- [22] Hikam, M.A. (2014). Menembus Middle Income Trap. Menyongsong 2014-2019: Memperkuat Indonesia Dalam Dunia Yang Berubah. *Badan Intelijen Negara (BIN)*. Jakarta: CV. Rumah Buku. ISBN: 978-602-70221-0-2.

- [23] Kamsori, M.E., Santosa, A.B. & Moe'is, S. (2007). *Dinamika Kehidupan Masyarakat Perkotaan*. Edisi ke-3. Bandung: Anggita Pustaka Mandiri.
- [24] Khasanah, N. (2013). Pengejawantahan Nilai-Nilai Dalam Pengembangan Budaya Gotong Royong Di Era Digital. *Edukasi*. Volume 01. Nomor 01. Halaman 92-108.
- [25] Kobayashi, K. & Shakaigaku, H. (2004). The Practice and Politics of "Tradition" in Indonesia: A Focus on Gotong Royong, Mutual Aid, and Night Watch by RT/RW, Urban Neighbourhood Association in the New Order. *Japanese Sociological Review*. Vol. 55. No.2. Halaman 98-114.
- [26] Koentjaraningrat. (1961). *Gotong Rojong: Some Social Anthropological observation on Practices in Two Villages of Central Java*. Claire Holt (Penerjemah). United Kingdom: Equinox Publishing. ISBN: 9786028397278.
- [27] Koentjaraningrat. (1988). The Indonesian Mentality and Development. *Journal of Social Issues in Southeast Asia*. Vol.3. No.2. Halaman 107-133.
- [28] Kusumasari, B. & Alam, Q. (2012). Local wisdom-based disaster recovery model in Indonesia. *Disaster Prevention and Management*. Vol.21. No.3. Halaman 351-369. DOI 10.1108/09653561211234525.
- [29] Modul Bidang Studi Kepemimpinan. (2015). Sub Bidang Studi Kepemimpinan Program Pendidikan Singkat Angkatan (PPSA) XX. Lembaga Ketahanan Nasional RI.
- [30] Modul Bidang Studi Pancasila Dan UUD Negara RI 1945. (2015). Sub Bidang Studi UUD NRI 1945 Dan Permasalahannya. Program Pendidikan Singkat Angkatan (PPSA) XX. Jakarta: Lembaga Ketahanan Nasional Republik Indonesia.
- [31] Mustaqim, A.H. (2013). Gotong Royong Dalam Dwilogi Padang Bulan dan Cinta Di Dalam Gelas Karya Andrea Hirata (Sebuah Kajian Sosiologi Sastra). *WANASTRA*. Vol. IV. No. 1.
- [32] Newberry, J. (2007). Rituals of Rule in the Administered Community: The Javanese Slametan Reconsidered. *Modern Asian Studies*. Volume 41. Nomor 6. Halaman 1295-1329. Cambridge University Press.
- [33] Novianty, A. (2011). Penyesuaian Dusun Jangka Panjang Ditinjau dari Resiliensi Komunitas Pasca Gempa. *Jurnal Psikologi*. Volume 38. No. 1. Halaman 30-39.
- [34] Nur, M., Djamal, M. & Rahim, H. (1981). Peranan Agama Dan Pengaruhnya Pada Desa Teladan Di Sulawesi Selatan. In *Evaluasi Hasil Penelitian Dasar IAIN Tahun 1979/1980*. Agama, perkembangan fikiran dan pembangunan. Proyek Pembinaan Perguruan Tinggi Agama/IAIN di Pusat. Jakarta: Direktorat Pembinaan Perguruan Tinggi Agama Islam.
- [35] Okten, C. & Osili, U. O. (2004). Contributions in heterogeneous communities: Evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of Population Economics*. Volume 17. Halaman 603-626. DOI 10.1007/s00148-004-0189-y.
- [36] Panjaitan, M. (2013). *Dari Gotong Royong Ke Pancasila*. Jakarta: Jala Permata Aksara.
- [37] Pattiradjawane, R.L. & Soebagjo, N. (2015). Global Maritime Axis: Indonesia, China, and a New Approach to Southeast Asian Regional Resilience. *International Journal of China Studies*. Vol. 6. No. 2. Halaman 175-185.
- [38] Pranadji, T. (2009). Penguatan Kelembagaan Gotong Royong dalam Perspektif Sosio Budaya Bangsa. *Jurnal Forum Penelitian Agro Ekonomi*. Vol. 27. No. 1. Halaman 61-72.
- [39] Pranowo, M. B. (2010). *Multidimensi Ketahanan Nasional*. Cetakan 1. September. Jakarta: Pustaka Alvabet. ISBN 978-979-3064-91-8.
- [40] Prawiroatmodjo, S. (1981). *Bausastra Jawa-Indonesia (Javanese-Indonesian Dictionary)*. Jakarta: Gunung Agung.
- [41] Prawitasari, J. (2016). Local wisdom, social capital, and "psikologi nusantara". Dalam Y.B. C. Widiyanto & A. Harimurti (Editor). *People's search for meaning through ethnicity, culture, and religion: Psychology's role in handling conflicts and sustaining harmony in multicultural society*. Proceedings of the International Conference on Psychology. Yogyakarta: Sanata Dharma University.
- [42] Profil Ketahanan Nasional Provinsi DIY. (2013). *Laboratorium Pengukuran Ketahanan Nasional*. Lemhannas RI.
- [43] Profil Ketahanan Nasional Provinsi DIY. (2019). *Laboratorium Pengukuran Ketahanan Nasional*. Lemhannas RI.
- [44] Putnam, R.D. (1993a). *Making democracy work*. Civic traditions in modern Italy. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- [45] Putnam, R.D. (1993b). The Prosperous Community: Sosial Capital and Public Life. *The American Prospect*. No. 13.
- [46] Putnam, R.D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and revival of American Community*. New York: Simon and Schuster. ISBN 9780684832838.
- [47] Raharjo, S. B. (2010). Pendidikan Karakter Sebagai Upaya Menciptakan Akhlak Mulia. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan*. Vol. 16. Nomor 3. Halaman 229-238.
- [48] Rochmadi, N. (2012). Gotong Royong sebagai common Identity dalam kehidupan Bertetangga Negara-Negara Asean. *Malang. Jurnal Forum Sosial*. Volume 9. Nomor 40. Universitas Negeri Malang.
- [49] Rofiana, V. (2016). Implementasi Modal Sosial Dalam Konteks Kesehatan Masyarakat Di Kecamatan Wonosalam, Kabupaten Jombang. *Proceeding of National Conference & Call for Papers*. Semangat Nasionalisme untuk Membangun Bangsa Melalui Sains dan Humaniora. Jakarta: Universitas 17 Agustus 1945. 25-26 Februari. ISBN: 978-602-74105-0-3.
- [50] Sarwono, S.W. (2017). Keteladanan penyelenggara negara dan penguatan mentalitas pelayanan. Dalam St. Sularto & A. Paramita (Editor) *Nilai Keindonesiaan: Tiada bangsa besar tanpa budaya kokoh*. Jakarta: PT Kompas Media Nusantara.
- [51] Sayuti, T. (1983). *Lima serangkai tentang hukum*. Jakarta: Bina Aksara.
- [52] Setiawan, D. (2013). Peran Pendidikan Karakter Dalam Mengembangkan Kecerdasan Moral. *Jurnal Pendidikan Karakter*. Tahun III. Nomor 1. Halaman 53-63.
- [53] Setiawan, H. & Zurbuchen, M. S. (2000). *Between The Bars*. Manoa. Volume 12. Number 1. 2000. Halaman 25-34.
- [54] Simarmata, H.T., Sunaryo, Fachrurozi, Purnama, C.S., Susanto, A., Nurjanah, N., Rizal, G.N. & Sapei, A. (2017). *Indonesia: Emerald chain of tolerance*. First Edition. February. Jakarta: Pusat Studi Islam dan Kenegaraan Indonesia (PSIK-Indonesia). ISBN: 978-602-72656-1-5.
- [55] *Sistem Pengukuran Ketahanan Nasional dan Simulasi Kebijakan Publik*. (2015). Edisi 5. Jakarta: Laboratorium Pengukuran Ketahanan Nasional. Lembaga Ketahanan Nasional Republik Indonesia.
- [56] Sugiyanto & Khamadi. (2011). *Perancangan Game Edukasi "Semangat Si Semut" Sebagai Media Untuk Menanamkan Semangat Gotong Royong Pada Anak Usia Dini*. Techno.COM. Vol. 10. No. 1. Halaman 35-40.
- [57] Sularto, S. & Paramita, A. (2017). *Nilai Keindonesiaan: Tiada bangsa besar tanpa budaya kokoh*. Jakarta: PT Kompas Media Nusantara.
- [58] Suryohadiprojo, S. (2016). *Budaya Gotong Royong dan Masa Depan Bangsa*. Jakarta: PT Kompas Media Nusantara.
- [59] Suwondo, B. (1982). *Sistem Gotong royong dalam masyarakat pedesaan daerah DIY*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- [60] Suwondo, B. (1983a). *Sistem Gotong royong dalam masyarakat pedesaan daerah Kalimantan Barat*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- [61] Suwondo, B. (1983b). *Sistem Gotong royong dalam masyarakat pedesaan daerah Sumatera Barat*. Jakarta: Depdikbud.
- [62] Syahardani, R. (2018). *Pengenalan Konsep Ketahanan Nasional dan Astagatra pada Peserta PPRA LVII*. Swantara. Majalah Triwulan Lemhanas RI. No.24. Tahun VII. Maret. Jakarta: LEMHANNAS RI.
- [63] Syahra, R. (2003). *Modal Sosial: Konsep Dan Aplikasi*. Jurnal Masyarakat dan Budaya. Volume 5. No. 1. Halaman 1-22.
- [64] Tashadi, M., Gatot, S. & Sukirman. (1982). *Sistem Gotong Royong dalam Masyarakat Pedesaan Daerah Istimewa Yogyakarta*. Jakarta: Departemen Pendidikan dan Kebudayaan.
- [65] Tim Penyusun KBBI. (2002). *Kamus Besar Bahasa Indonesia*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- [66] Titisari, E.Y., Triwinarto, J. & Suryasari, N. (2012). Konsep Ekologis pada Arsitektur di Desa Bendosari. *Jurnal RUAS*. Volume 10. No 2. Halaman 20-31. ISSN 1693-3702.
- [67] Triwidodo, I. (2017). *Pasang Surut Kehidupan Berbangsa dan Bernegara Masyarakat Indonesia*. Swantara. Majalah Triwulan Lemhanas RI. No.22. Tahun VI. September. Jakarta: LEMHANNAS RI.
- [68] *Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 17 Tahun 2007 Tentang Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Panjang Nasional Tahun 2005 – 2025*.

- [69] Wingarta, P.S. (2017). Meremajakan Pancasila Guna Meningkatkan Ketahanan Nasional. Swantara. Majalah Triwulan Lemhanas RI. No.20. Tahun VI. Maret. Jakarta: LEMHANNAS RI.
- [70] Woolcock, M. (1998). Social capital and economic development: Toward a theoretical synthesis and policy framework. *Theory and society*. Vol.27. No.2. Halaman 151-208.
- [71] Yuniarti, K.W. (2015). Meningkatkan Kualitas Pendidikan Masyarakat Melalui Revolusi Mental Guna Memperkuat Identitas Sosial Budaya Dalam Rangka Ketahanan Nasional. Program Pendidikan Singkat Angkatan XX Lembaga Ketahanan Nasional RI Tahun 2015. Lembaga Ketahanan Nasional Republik Indonesia.
- [72] Zakaria, H.G. (2017). 5 Pilar revolusi mental: untuk aparatur negara. Jakarta: Penerbit PT Elex Media Komputindo.
- [73] Zaumseil, M., Schwarz, S., Von Vacano, M., Sullivan, G.B. & Prawitasari-hadiyono, J.E. (2014). *Cultural psychology of coping with disaster: The case of an earthquake in Java, Indonesia*. New York: Springer.