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1 Introduction

Cultural heritage villages in many rural areas function by exhibiting the everyday life of rural indigenous communities (Zhang, 2018; Whitney-Squire et al., 2018), romanticising the dreamland of a nation/region in the past (Zhang, 2017), and commercialising rural life through the small medium enterprises in the community (Pickel-Chevalier and Ketut, 2016). It is the function of cultural heritage to construct imaginings of the nation (Aronczyk, 2013). According to Anderson’s framework of ‘imagined communities’, people consider what they think is important, how to achieve or negotiate a certain standard of identity, and the way they imagine the nation in cultural settings (Graham et al., 2016). Although the geographical location of a village is within a nation, the space functions not only as a supporting unit to nation identity, but also as an area of reinterpretation to negotiate the nation’s ideals and local ideological culture (Ashworth, 2017).

Further, Barthel-Bouchier (2016) argues that, despite increases in programmatic commitments to sustainability, socio-economic contradictions and tensions challenge many global locations of heritage village communities. In developing cultural heritage villages, the interpretations of how local people sense their place, interact with their cultural identities, negotiate the idyllic standard of the nation, and follow tourism demands become the variables to consider (Ashworth, 2017). Such issues determine the ways in which local communities understand landscape, their civic roles, and their interpretations of the nation’s imaginings without losing their own local identities and voices (Graham et al., 2016).

Those issues raise research inquiries as to how the local people in cultural heritage villages perceive their nation’s imaginings and how these imaginings influence the constructions of cultural heritage villages. Specifically, this study aims to explore:

1 How the local people in cultural heritage villages imagine the nation through the space of heritage in their community.

2 How the heritage village community preserves cultural identity and performs the idyllic concept of village for the nation.

These objectives were examined using the interconnections of space (Massey, 2005), imagined communities (Anderson, 1991), and nation branding (Anholt, 2007). These theories try to understand the connections between sensing place and space that construct heritage village communities as the idyllic standard of nation through the implementation of nation branding.

The Indonesian village was selected as the context of the study based on two main reasons. First, the study explores the interconnections of space, imagined community, and nation branding practices as a result of local understanding with the imaginings of nation. The social, political, cultural, and economic conditions of Indonesia provide a diverse background against which to understand the long-standing tensions in the relationship between nation and village (Antlöv et al., 2016). Previous research, however, includes only limited discussion of the local’s sense of space as a means of interpreting the presence of national authority in the realm of the cultural heritage village (Rusyiana and Sujarwoto, 2017; Tolkach and King, 2015). Second, opening villages for tourists through the exhibition of housing, natural landscape, cultural activities, and commercialisation is today played out largely in many desa wisata/cultural heritage villages across Indonesia.
Locating nation in a village

Converting rural villages for tourism was popular in Europe since 1970 with the concept of tourism in the rural space or ‘tourism en espace rural (TER)’ (Ciolac et al., 2017), especially in France (Ciolac, 2016), Austria, and Switzerland. However, Indonesia offers different dynamics on the discussion of villages for tourists. Not only the villages in Indonesia encompass the tensions between nation and people in rural area (Pickel-Chevalier and Ketut, 2016), and challenges in the local socio and political system (Ernawati et al., 2015), but also the culture, custom, and practices of tourism are different based on the identities of postcolonial nation, ethnic diversity, and history (Mitchell, 1994). The cultural heritage villages, as a term in this research, are used to point at rural villages, that been converted for tourism purposes with strong local identity and mobility to conserve the cultural heritage materials (Boonzaaier and Wels, 2018). The selected village of Penglipuran were chosen not only that it became the earliest cultural heritage villages with a community initiative built in 1992 (Yamashita, 1993), but also the model of the village has been replicated to convert other villages across Indonesia (Mitchell, 1994).

Using an ethnographic approach, by interviewing local people, observing the space of heritage, conducting participant observation in tour packages, and investigating relevant documents, the research project attempts to open up a conversation about what is at stake in these desa wisata or cultural heritage villages especially in relation to the nation and village. In this context, the selected case study, which is the village of Penglipuran, works as a state of remembrance for local people to imagine their own local identity, to interpret the nation’s spirit, and to perform their local heritage. Three means are used to perform the idyllic village for the nation: designing landscape for the construction of social membership, performing loyalty in the local space of the imagined community, and implementing nation brand in the village. Finally, the fusion of local values in the remembrances of the nation’s symbols in the village is also a part of maintaining the village’s connection with its locality, promoting cultural tourism, and constructing loyalty from local Balinese to the nation.

2 Literature review

In the Indonesian context, one of the most powerful texts and discourses for shaping the ‘Indonesianess’ of diverse ethnic groups is the performance of cultural heritage villages or desa wisata (Dahles, 2002; Khamdevi and Bott, 2017; Manaf et al., 2018; Murti, 2019). The desa wisata is a representation of local involvement in the construction of idyllic village and nation. The cultural heritage villages are examples of communities experiencing constant changes from both external and local influences, which are putting heritage identity and community at stake (Whelan, 2016; Murti, 2019). Studying cultural heritage villages requires paying attention to the cultural materials, symbols, and meanings produced by local people. Three interrelating principles become the basic of the analysis in this research.

Firstly, cultural heritage villages are best conceptualised as spaces in which to identify (some) trajectories of social relations (Harvey, 2015). Massey’s work (2005) is relevant to examine a tourist village as a space of interrelations, which can be understood by learning the everyday operation and exploring opportunities for multiple stories, not only a single story. The space of heritage is also an area of possibilities for multiplicity,
where various trajectories and heterogenic narratives exist to negotiate the becoming; a heritage space also reconnects with the ownership of space (Mowforth and Munt, 1998). Heritage is not only a part of national legacy, but also a battle on the possession and power to define the preserved materials for the heritage performances (Waterton and Watson, 2010).

Second, a cultural heritage village is not an object but rather a process for constructing the imaginings of a place (Anderson, 1991). Anderson describes a nation as “an imagined political community” (1991, p.6). Accordingly, Anderson (1991) argues that nation consists of accumulations and collections of cultural objects that are ‘imagined.’ A cultural heritage space becomes touristic because of the involvement of the civic practice in the imagined community (Little and Shackel, 2016). The civic practice brings together collaboration between artists, designers, heritage holders, and local people around community to define their heritage performances, spaces, and artefacts. To spread the information to the public, this practice generates community-marketing strategies leading to the production of texts and images to represent the imaginings of nation (Tang-Taye and Standing, 2016). Thus, the imagined community contributes to the construction of spectacles and commodities, which are an important part of the imagined community for the local people (Staiff, 2016; Younan and Treadaway, 2015).

Third, cultural heritage villages produce particular heritage identities for local people, which then shape their perceptions, demand certain ways of observation, and exclude others in order to blend their interpretations to the nation branding (Younan and Treadaway, 2015). I employ four characteristics of spectacles (Waterton and Watson, 2010) as tools to examine the heritage identity of local people to create their own interpretations of nation branding in the heritage local space. First, I consider attractive objects and objects that should be maintained by local people. Next, I examine the arranged, organised, and disposed vision within numerous visual materials and their meanings. I also investigate cultural materials, symbols and stories that can potentially be transformed into commodities. Once an object becomes a commodity, it must then be repeatedly reproduced in order to allow it to be consumed (Younan and Treadaway, 2015). Finally, I consider that subjects/spectators relate the spectacle to their selves and to social issues (Waterton and Watson, 2010).

The analysis of Penglipuran village suggests that the notion of cultural heritage villages is useful in two ways. Firstly, it gives an understanding of how cultural collections have been preserved powerfully as a heritage, commercialised as a collective economic income, and passed through generations and outsiders through media and tourism settings (Graves-Brown, 2016). Secondly, it describes a set of connections between local people and tourists, which maintain the cultural collections through the trajectories of social relations in a heritage space (Massey, 2005).

3 Methodology

An ethnographic approach is employed in this project. Davis’ turbine model is used to identify who should be interviewed during the process of research (2011). In this model (Figure 1), there are three main steps that involve the interview participants – community participation, in-situ preservation, and local development – which are circulated, in a development turbine (Davis, 2011). A similar process was conducted by Liu and Lee (2015) who developed a similar model to research the case of ecomuseums in Taiwan. In
In the present study, there are 24 informants who are interviewed and observed for between 60 and 150 minutes.

To obtain supplementary data in the context of the interviews, the research project also investigates local and national documents related to cultural policy, such as those related to Pedoman Pokdarwis (Tourism Awareness Group guidelines) and the Brand Design Application Guidelines of Wonderful Indonesia that influence Bali and Indonesia at large.

This step functions to enable the comprehension of the rationale behind the everyday decision to preserve Penglipuran village for local, regional, and national purposes. Next, specifically for observation data, this research adopts the phenomenological approach to heritage proposed by Selby (2016) that encompasses components of visualising, representing, performing, perceiving, knowing, and acting. These components provide a basis for understanding cultural heritage, which is then further interrogated using the ethnographic approach.

**Figure 1** Selection of groups from locals who participate in the interviews (see online version for colours)

![Diagram](image-url)

*Source:* Adopted from Davis (2011) and Liu and Lee (2015)
4 Findings

Since 2012, with the national platform of desa wisata, the government of Indonesia has supported the establishment of 928 villages throughout the country (Kompas, 2012). Under the desa wisata concept, local community can demonstrate their everyday life through the performances of local artefacts and activities to preserve the imaginings of the agricultural and cultural diversity of the nation (Pickel-Chevalier and Ketut, 2016; Mitchell, 1994). Using self-sufficient village grants, government incentives, competitions, training, national standard ratings, and the establishment of village agents, the villages serve not only for tourism and local economies, but also for pursuing the resemblance of national power (Ernawati et al., 2015). Among the most substantial example of Indonesian cultural heritage villages is Penglipuran.

Penglipuran is administratively a part of Bangli regency in the Western part of Bali Province. The village stretches along 113 hectares, but the residential area only comprises around 9 hectares, with 2.2 kilometres of street stretching around the village. Since 1992, Penglipuran has become one of the first three pioneers of village preservation in Bali (and Indonesia), alongside the Tenganan ancient village and Jati Luwih, which is positioned as a World Heritage paddy terrace (Yamashita, 2003). At that point, converting villages for tourism and letting the community to manage the tourism independently became an alternative option to prevent the conversion of locally owned land and/or customary land to the ownership of investors and hotel developers who have no sustainable plan for locals (Mitchell, 1994; Reuter, 1999; Yamashita, 2003). In the locations where the village for tourism is established, the universities and researchers encourage local communities, who already have a strong village structure and support, to become actively involved in the design, management, and operation of this novel tourism typology (Mitchell, 1994; Yamashita, 2003). Previously, the ordinary village of Penglipuran was preserved and redecorated in early 1990 by a local residents’ movement drawn together to preserve their traditional houses. University students from Udayana University and the head of the regency of Bangli joined the effort in 1991 by supporting funding and hospitality training (Reuter, 1999; Yamashita, 2003). At that time, Bali was also preparing for the visit of President Soeharto in 1992, including Penglipuran (even though the visit was cancelled). Soeharto’s vision of an idyllic village for the exhibition of nation diversity and performance of the ethnic community has continued in the use of Penglipuran as a model for other cultural heritage villages across Indonesia (Mitchell, 1994; Yamashita, 2003).

4.1 How do local people interpret their heritage space?

The local people imagine the nation in cultural heritage by designing their landscape to support their social membership. The construction of the Penglipuran village follows the cultural philosophy of human body, land ownership, and compulsory membership in the village. However, the locals also struggle to sustain their values, due to the practice of tourism performance and population growth.

First, the local people interpret landscape as a human body consisting of head, body, and feet. Their residential area also relates closely to the membership of the local group to which they belong (Figure 2).
“The landscape was built based on the principle of Tri Angga, or “like a body,” with Hulu or the Head consisting of the sacred temple, the Antara or Body consisting of a residential area, common facilities, and the preserved forest, and, lastly, Teben or Feet, which consist of cemeteries and forest.” (LP-01)

Figure 2  *Penglipuran* Village, in Bangli, Bali (see online version for colours)

Source:  Photo by author (2017)

The zoning system in the village and the houses is based on Hindu Balinese spiritual and philosophical values. Similar to previous research findings on Bali, these values are represented through the icons, experiences, symbols, and stories, including the philosophy of space evident in the houses (Putra et al., 2015; Pickel-Chevalier and Ketut, 2016). They are accumulated through perceived local symbols that should be preserved (Pitana, 2010). The sense of space in *Penglipuran* produces widespread community knowledge on how to develop their residential areas. Distribution of images and texts explains this sense of space as heritage knowledge and reproduces collective imaginings not only to the local people but also to visitors and the media (Hobsbawm and Ranger, 1983; Tang-Taye and Standing, 2016). The local values become a form of cultural expression for imagining the practice of religious values in everyday life (Knott, 2015), giving an identity to the village (Smith, 2015), and preserving the culture for commercialisation and/or conservation of heritage efforts (Lu et al., 2015).

Secondly, *Penglipuran* heritage spaces are invented materials, where the residential space becomes the subject of constant change, shift, and contestation. The changes of spaces and local perceptions are related to capital needs, population growth, and privacy value.

“We have 76 houses in the preservation area which use the *Tri Mandala* or three zoning system. This concept divides the housing space into the family sacred zone (sanggah) as the main zone (Head), the living zone or pawongan as the middle zone (Body), and the *Nista* are for the toilet, garbage, and small farm cages (Feet).”(LP-03)
According to the illustration above (Figure 3), some extended family members have converted houses in the Nista area (the bottom part of human body which is usually associated with ‘backstage’ or ‘dirty stuff’) into new buildings with functional purposes (Dwijayasastra, 2013). Pragmatically, since the residents cannot have additional floors due to the restrictions of local rules, they use the backyard land to build more rooms and houses to live in or as homestay facilities. Indeed, this drives preservation into capital interest by changing the rules to allow the conversion of Nista into residential houses.

“The decision to change the Nista area is an adjustment to the increasing population and families in the villages and it is based on the consensus of the village rules or awig-awig.” (LP-02)

Similar to Zhu’s research in Chinese villages (2015) this study found that the authentic space in a cultural heritage space is a social process influenced by local practice. The value of space in Penglipuran has shifted within the dynamic negotiations of local and global, in which locals are not passive recipients (Zhu, 2015). The locals consume, contest and negotiate the concept of authentic places (Zhu, 2015). However, the
residential space in this village is also at stake, because within few years, as the population grows and produces more extended family, and/or the demand for homestay increases, the people in the village will need to reassess their residential space.

About the third way in which local people imagine their heritage space relates to the perception of private and personal space. The local perception of ‘backstage’ is limited to the main house and bedrooms. The valuing of privacy influences the way in which the social space for the staging of authenticity is imagined (Di Domenico and Lynch, 2007). The locals can negotiate their privacy as long as it can support tourism demand to ‘gaze’ at the houses. Domestic symbols such as toilets and kitchens are used to support the performances of the home as stage (Di Domenico and Lynch, 2007).

“If the host family has a good kitchen, they let the guests enter. But if not, they will prefer the guests to stay outside the kitchen.” (LP-08)

“We have two kitchens. One is the traditional kitchen (a hut made of bamboo) and using firewoods that we preserved in the front side of the house. We still use it, although not very often, or just our elderlies who use it. The other kitchen is our regular kitchen with the gas stove.” (LP-09)

“We have two toilets. One toilet is for the guest and one for us. Usually for the guest we provide sit toilet with bidet and shower, but for us, we like to use the squad style with regular bucket.” (LP-10)

Guests and homeowners also use different types of bathroom facilities. Guests are provided with separate ‘sit’ western style toilets and showers, while locals use ‘squat’ toilets and a bucket of water for bathing. The kitchen can sometimes be ‘back’ or ‘front’, depending on the condition of the kitchen. This is an element of the spatial management strategies employed by the hosts to negotiate the identity markers and normative practices of a ‘good house’ (Di Domenico and Lynch, 2007).

Meanwhile, the main street of Penglipuran functions as the main exhibition and spectacle of the village. The main street is the centre of the tourist gaze. The tourists walk down the street and follow the guide who is explaining about Penglipuran village. Social interactions between tourists and local people are limited to occasions when the local people greet the tourists and invite them to enter their houses, to look around, and/or to purchase souvenirs. Similar to Di Domenico and Lynch’s research (2007) on home spaces, the interactions between locals and visitors appear to be limited to the commercial setting, which employs a sequential mechanism of social control, and boundary setting, surrounded by tacit procedures.

The imaginary line of private space and tourist space exists in perceptual and cognitive landscapes to identify the identity and borderline of ‘other’ (Throsby, 2016). The idea of ‘staged authenticity’ similarly explains how culture is staged and performed to attract an audience in the space where the ‘others’, or the audience, can be defined. It has been prepared, organised, and managed to provide touristic experiences. Further, MacCannell argues that the ‘back’ region is also sellable to the tourist industry. People want to know what is happening ‘behind the stage’ and the brand of ‘authentic’ or ‘real life’ information is attached to certain types of tourism. In the case of the Penglipuran village, the cultural heritage construction similarly demonstrates the brand of ‘backstage’ in Balinese life. Apart from the glamorous hotels, commercialised beaches and streets, and/or performativity of ceremonies and dances, tourists are attracted to know the ‘real life’ of Balinese people. Penglipuran village offers this experience by welcoming tourists.
to the people’s houses and letting the tourists explore the private/social spaces of the houses.

The imaginings of an idyllic village community are recreated through reconstructions of membership, private space, and repetitive performance through generations and time. This notion of social membership similarly reflects Geertz’s argument (1959) which indicates that the village in Bali is constructed to coordinate all aspects of communal life. However, in terms of local struggles to maintain communal identity and national identity, Rubinstein and Connor (1999) argue that what is at stake is not identity per se in any constructive sense. People in Bali are used to working with many intersections of identity, such as being Balinese, Hindu, young people, Indonesian, women, students, and workers in different situations and complex combinations. It is the mobilisation in the struggle over resources such as the land, environment, political right, religious tolerance, infrastructure and capital that creates a further discourse of identity. Rubinstein and Connor (1999) argue that the practice of everyday life is the main discourse to define which identities are problematic. Consistently, in the case of Penglipuran, maintaining an identity as a community that constructs the space to support social membership is contested and challenged by the demands of capital income, increasing population, and the valuing of privacy as the everyday discourse.

4.2 How do the locals interpret the idyllic village as a part of the imagined community?

Penglipuran village constructs its position as the imagined community through various symbols and cultural materials centralised in the area of Balai Banjar or community meeting hall (Figure 4). The local people imagine the nation by performing the village orders and national ideals to the members of the community; perform obedience to structural power by displaying authoritative symbols, missions, and icons, and negotiate values between the local village and the nation. This approach, consequently, places a rhetorical construction upon the loyalty of the village to the nation (Vickers, 2013).

**Figure 4**  *Balai Banjar in Penglipuran Village (see online version for colours)*

*Source:* Photo by author (2017)
The second view of the Penglipuran preservation process as a heritage tourism village is offered by the existence of Balai Banjar or a large open spaced pavilion used as a village community centre. The Balinese community hall (known in wider Indonesia as Balai Desa) consists of village offices such as the community health centre office and family welfare movement office, and many other functional rooms depending on the needs of the village. This place generally functions as a meeting space for the community to implement the national civic movement spirit, called ‘gotong royong’, or voluntary work for the community (mutual assistance). The community hall in Penglipuran emphasises the historic role of the village community as the place for people’s movement, the civic participation in voluntary work for the community, and village structural membership over a number of centuries.

The connection between the preservation movement and the early independence spirit derived from the agricultural and collective aspects of the nation, voluntary work for the community or gotong royong, cast the origin of Penglipuran’s preservation into an imagined community. The term gotong royong emphasises the element of ‘Indonesian culture’, which was addressed by then-President Soekarno on 1 July 1945, to describe in Indonesian terms the native characteristics of Indonesian people (Bowen, 1986). Mohammad Hatta (the first Vice President of Indonesia) also mentioned it on January 23, 1946, as a social revolutionary spirit to revive the people based on social justice and voluntary work for the community (Bowen, 1986). The Department of Education and Culture of Indonesia also utilised Soeharto’s concept of volunteering in 1983. They produced guidebooks and organised competitions amongst villages, which required the spirit of volunteering for community as one of the winning elements.

“In 1993, after we fixed up the street, redecorated the garden, and fixed the angkul-angkul (entrance gate made of bamboo), we joined the competition and won some of them. One of the categories in the competition is the implementation of gotong royong (collective volunteering/free labour) in the community.” (LP-01)

The existence of community hall in almost all villages across Indonesia is the result of imagining the architecture of Indonesian politics and economics in rural areas, especially villages. It creates a collage of similar and shared experiences across villages in Indonesia related to how villages should function in relation to the state (Jameson, 2004). This constitutes the power relationship between the villages and the nation (Bowen, 1986). Specifically, some icons and symbols in the community hall show the loyalty of the idyllic village to the nation. For example, local people display pictures of the Indonesian President, Vice President, and Garuda Indonesia as a national symbol (Figure 5). They also display the ten Programs of Pembinaan Kesejahteraan Keluarga or PKK, a program initiated by the central government of Indonesia for villages or kampung/urban neighbourhood communities.

A closer look at the language modes and the genre of symbols in the area of community hall indicates the formal and regulatory approach, which affirms the existence and recognition of nation state, the obedience of civic membership to authority, and the regulation of local behaviour in the public space. The concept of civic practice comprises the memory of the nation spirit and symbolic materials related to authority and national power.

The personalised modes of approach of the local people to the common existence of nation symbols also exist in the decorative and attractive symbols around the area. For
example, the name *Balai Banjar* uses the Balinese language of Banjar instead of Desa. In addition, *Penglipuran* exhibits Balinese architecture and Balinese stage carvings as the centre of attention in the community hall. There are *Saput Poleng* or black and white cloth (considered a sacred symbol of the battle between good and evil) draped over trees, statues, and wooden pillars and worn by people in ceremonies or events in community hall. These are personalised symbols, which exist along with the nation spirit and also indicate the local ownership and internalisation of local identity along with national imaginings.

**Figure 5** Photos of the President, Vice President and Garuda bird as the symbol of national authority commonly found in community hall in Bali and other Indonesian areas (see online version for colours)

Source: Photo by author (2017)

Tensions related to tourism activities around community hall are in the issue of income distribution. For example, in *Penglipuran*, a sense of both pride and exploitation by the nation still reappears in the interviews.

“*Penglipuran* produces a high number of visitors. Thus, we need to contribute around 60% of our ticket income and parking retribution to the regional government, which then accumulated as the PAD or Pendapatan Asli Daerah (Regional Income) of Bangli and Bali as a province. Then, included as an income for Indonesia. We are the highest contributor in Bangli.”(LP-04)

“Currently, the village leaders still try to re-negotiate the share of capital with the regional government. It is too much, I think.”(LP-05)

“I would say it is rather exploitative because this is local efforts and we have to spend money for rituals and village operational.”(LP-06)

The tension between the feeling of pride at contributing income to the government and the perception of exploitation is evident in several interviews. The loyalty to authority can also put heritage at stake because the space becomes an arena of exploitation in the form of free labour or volunteerism and profit making (Wiener, 1999; Vickers, 2013). As Adams (2004) argues, in terms of income distribution and sharing, heritage is politically
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contested. It depends on the decisions of local authorities with regard to how much income they would take to subsidise other locations in the same region. However, as a complex exchange, the infusion of local politics in heritage, especially related to profit sharing, creates two contrasting discourses: locals may perceive it as a symbol of achievement or as an exploitation (Hobsbawm and Ranger 1983; Picard, 1990).

The people of Penglipuran negotiate their local values and national spirit to perform ‘idyllic’ heritage village practices. This is an important commodity of heritage which affirms the existence and recognition of nation-state, the obedience of the civic membership to authority, and the regulation of local behaviour in the public space. The Penglipuran villages delivers a set of inter-textual codes from social relations and memories to negotiate contemporary challenges. This practice is similar to the arguments of Hough (1999) and Hobart (1999) exploring the manifestations of contemporary Balinese culture which represent ‘Balinese’ as the dominant face of ‘Indonesian culture’ to a global audience. Therefore, even though nation culture and internationalised representations of Bali co-exist, the dynamic tensions of locals and nation still need to be mitigated.

4.3 How do locals interpret the implementation of nation branding?

Locals’ interpretations of nation branding are demonstrated in the existence of Pokdarwis or Kelompok Sadar Wisata (Tourism Awareness Group). The preservation movement of Penglipuran village was formally institutionalised in 2012, along with the program from the Indonesian government under Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono’s administration called Pokdarwis. According to the guidebook of the Tourism Awareness Group (Pedoman Pokdarwis) published by the Director General of Tourism Destination Development in 2012, tourism awareness group is the embodiment of cooperation between government, private sectors, and local community. It functions to support the ground-up process in tourism and to empower the community to be ready to develop tourism based on national standards. In this guidebook, tourism awareness group is designed to be the ‘driving element’ in the community where tourism destinations are established.

“Members of Pokdarwis are expected to be the figures in the local community who can motivate, communicate, and move. The job of Pokdarwis is to be the agents of change to create a tourist-friendly atmosphere according to the national guidelines of Sapa Pesona or Seven Wonders.” (LP-07)

The seven wonders are brand values of the Indonesian nation branding ‘The Wonderful Indonesia’. Those values are ‘security, order, cleanliness, freshness, beauty, friendliness, and memories’ (Figure 6). The tourism awareness group is then institutionalised through the village organisations; the membership is recorded and formalised in the documents of the village at sub-district, district, and provincial level. The tourism awareness group also become an administrative requirement for state funding to establish tourism in villages across Indonesia.

In the case of Penglipuran, the local people institutionalised the tourism awareness group into a village tourism management agency or Lembaga Pengelola Desa Wisata. Even though membership of tourism awareness group is on a voluntary basis, the village gets to profit from any tourism project, tour package, and/or demand for speakers to speak on behalf of the village’s tourism efforts. The members may also receive a small incentive. Once the membership of tourism awareness group is formalised, members may
receive trainings from authorities including the ministry, and provincial, district, and subdistrict levels. They may also represent the village in joining competition among villages as an assessment and evaluation of how well the tourism awareness group move the local people to fulfil the Seven Wonders principle.

**Figure 6** The sign of seven wonders of Indonesia (see online version for colours)

Training and competition are two of the many efforts on the part of the national and regional governments to develop tourism since the Soeharto era (Picard, 1990). In the Penglipuran village, the members of tourism awareness group work to emphasise the relatively technical aspects of preservation and village decoration, producing tour packages, events, and publications for the village, and communicate with village leaders. As the members envision the preservation and tourism, in the same time, the members of tourism awareness group in Penglipuran expand the view of existing cultural assets and objects by participating in local, regional, national, and international competitions or training along with other tourist villages across Indonesia.

Another display of information in the Desa Wisata is the provision of information about the Sapta Pesona or Seven Wonders to commemorate the existence of tourism awareness group and local understanding of the ‘Wonderful Indonesia’ brand. This kind of information is a requirement in competitions. In the office of tourism awareness group, a signboard is also displayed saying ‘Padamu Bangli, kami mengabdi’ or ‘To you Bangli, we serve’, as a tagline to show the loyalty to the region of Bangli, where Penglipuran village is administratively located.

These official signs and symbolic materials indicate how the nation expresses identities through logos, slogans, national monuments, and official symbols in the cultural heritage villages (Anholt, 2007; Holt, 2004; Sumaco and Richardson, 2011). These are media, which function as a tool to broadcast the symbolic identities of a nation and to disseminate nation brand values and principles (Sumaco and Richardson, 2011). In another sense, the presence of these signs shows the loyalty of a community to the nation (Wiener, 1999; Vickers, 2013; Picard, 1990).
Through the existence of tourism awareness group, the nation’s purpose and identities are constructed and transmitted to connect the imagined community. This research finds that Pokdarwis has several roles in echoing the voices of authority. First, the group serves as the bridge between the local people and the representative body of the nation to negotiate the romanticism of national values and purposes. Second, the members become the agent of the nation to homogenise the standard of heritage tourist village program, through the implementation of Seven Wonders and other technical aspects in the training or competition materials. Third, the group is the operational agent when it comes to accommodating the diversity of local voices for the nation.

5 Discussions: fusion of local symbols and the nation imaginings

The findings show that the local people in the cultural heritage village perceived the space of heritage as a dynamic and contested place. This was projected since a cultural heritage village space is results from the dynamic process of social relations (Massey, 2005; Zhu, 2015). In this cultural heritage village, the tensions of the space overlap between local values/principles on social membership, privacy and interactional space, population growth, and capital needs. More essentially, the local principles and commitments to preserve their heritage space based on their values, in accordance with Geertz’s (1959) research, have been the strongest anchor in negotiating the demands of tourism and/or the idyllic imaginings of village for the nation. Through local spatial management strategy (Di Domenico and Lynch, 2007), the staging of houses and landscape is still able to sustain the local principles and agreement, although some changes may occur (Ernawati et al., 2017; Yudantini and Jones, 2015).

Additionally, the cultural heritage village space is perceived to have inextricable purposes (performance of local principles, fulfilment of tourist demand, and achieving idyllic standards of a village) to gain legitimacy from the nation. In particular, it aims to gain village funding, to meet competition requirements, to achieve recognition, and to make a local contribution to the nation (Jameson, 2004; Picard, 1990). Although this finding seems to reflect the long historical approach to the relationship between nation and village (Jameson, 2004; Picard, 1990), it is important to add that the construction of common villages for cultural heritage tourism is perceived as a local source of pride and achievement to sustain local identity alongside nation imaginings. The exploitative nuance between nation and village since the Soeharto era (Adams, 2004) is currently mitigated through the existence of tourism awareness group or Pokdarwis or a fusion body to accommodate the local systems and nation imaginings embedded in the cultural heritage village. In this body, the space of negotiation is open through explicit and implicit symbols, icons, procedures and efforts. The constructed body of tourism awareness group as a requirement to build cultural heritage village ensures the nation imaginings as well as the appearances of local identity. Tourism awareness group, which appears as the agent that interprets nation imaginings, identifies locals’ issues, and raises awareness and implementation of nation branding from inside the heritage community, is a crucial body in the fusion process.

The findings indicate that, due to the historical changes in social, cultural, and political aspects in Indonesia, the ‘power’ to negotiate the village local system and nation imaginings is shifted and opened. The nation imaginings were not imposed in an inimical
experience; rather, the space of negotiation from the local cultural heritage community is available through various opportunities and bodies (Zhu, 2015). In other words, the nation imaginings were adjusted based on the community’s interpretive power, initiative, and efforts to achieve the ‘idyllic’ standard, especially when the standard has been clearly stated through the brand values of Wonderful Indonesia (Oisina and Sugianto, 2017). The findings suggest that the constructions of the cultural heritage village across Indonesia need to maintain the representations of Indonesian nation branding by adjusting the local ability to interpret and implement their own identity alongside nation imaginings. The opportunity for locals to personalise and fuse their identity, as noted by the research participants, demonstrates local ownership of nation imaginings.

The fusion of local symbols and nation imaginings in the space of the cultural heritage village should be seen as a symbolic process rather than as a stagnant model for the growing number of converted villages across Indonesia. Even though Penglipuran village is chosen as the replicative model for other ethnic communities and rural villages, Penglipuran’s residents’ strength to speak their voices and their abilities to fuse their identities with nation imaginings are essential powers (Sudarwani and Priyoga, 2018). The diversity of performances in cultural heritage villages is the key to sustaining nation imaginings. This finding is consistent with previous research arguing that the construction of cultural heritage communities for nation imaginings should consider and adjust to the specific social, cultural, historical, and even political contexts (Kusno, 2014; Su et al., 2018).

6 Concluding remarks

From the case of Penglipuran, this study revealed that the construction of cultural heritage villages results from the locating process of the imagined nation through the local people. The current research maintains that the cultural heritage village functions to show the resemblances of national power (Ernawati et al., 2015). Furthermore, this study contributes to the question of how, practically and theoretically, the model of the cultural heritage village performs the idyllic representation of the village for the nation. Local people actively engage in the changes and challenges that occur in their heritage space by looking at their principles in space, their understanding of the imagined community, and their interpretation of nation branding.

It may be argued that, to achieve the idyllic nature, the cultural heritage community must perform loyalty to the nation (Vickers, 2013; Picard, 1990; Wiener, 1999). This can put local voices and interests at stake, in that the locals may feel exploited by the nation, as this research has discussed. However, having national agents through institutionalised bodies and national values that are formed around normative achievements opens the space of negotiation for locals to pursue their voices, interpretations, and interests. As a result, cultural heritage constructs the ownership of local space by representing concepts of ‘our’, such as ‘our land’ and ‘our culture’ [Baranowski and Furlough, (2001), p.9].

Finally, the current research agrees that the construction of cultural heritage spaces is produced through unequal power-relations, meaning that some groups have greater power to promote and authorise cultural heritage places than others (Foster, 2002; Postill, 2006). Nonetheless, opening opportunities for local people to generate text, images, and discourses, and positioning locals as the main components, may enable the distribution of
the power to influence how the nation is imagined (Foster, 2002; Postill, 2006; Urry, 2002).
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Notes

1 *Angkul-angkul*: Entrance gate made of bamboo.
2 *Awig-awig*: Local consensus and rules regarding the livelihood in the Balinese village.
3 *Tri Angga*: The concept in which landscape is considered as a human body. The concept is related to the building placements and village landscape constructions, and should be related to the position of mountains, with the north side and the east side as the holy directions. *Tri Angga* consists of *Hulu*, *Antara*, and *Teben*. 
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4 *Hulu:* This means the upper course or the head; usually refers to the north of where the mountain is located or the east which is considered to be the holy direction in Hindu Balinese. This is where the Balinese place their temples.

5 *Antara:* Represents the idea of body, where the activities of the public are usually located, including preparation ceremonies, residential houses and meeting areas.

6 *Teben:* Downstream or in the opposite direction to the upstream or the legs. This is where the parking area, the place to slaughter animals, forest, and cemeteries are located.

7 *Tri Mandala:* A concept that explains the macrocosms and the microcosms, especially related to household and residential houses. Similar to the human body that can be divided into three parts: *Utama*, *Madya*, and *Nista*.

8 *Utama:* The place where sacred activities are located such as family temples.

9 *Madya:* The place for daily activities, social interactions, and preparations for rituals.

10 *Nista:* The place for activities related to dirty things or activities, such as the kitchen, toilets, and places for animals.

11 *Krama:* Member of society.

12 *Saput Poleng:* or black and white cloth, which is considered a sacred symbol of the battle between good and evil in Hindu Bali. The cloth is usually draped over trees, statues, and wooden pillars, which believed have spirits, and worn by people in ceremonies or events.

13 *Balai Banjar:* In Indonesia, it is known as Balai Desa. The term is taken from the word Balai or a place for meeting or gathering; and Desa or village, in Bali, Desa is Banjar. *Balai Banjar* exists in many village in Bali as a community meeting house.