

The sociocultural basis of Indonesian philanthropy: Keeping citizens willing to share amid a pandemic

Iqbal Arpanudin¹, Karim Suryadi¹, Elly Malihah², Leni Anggraeni¹

¹ Civic Education Department, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

² Sociology Education Department, Universitas Pendidikan Indonesia, Bandung, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

This article aims to dig deeper into the concept of Indonesian philanthropy in dealing with the pandemic seen from the social base of the Indonesian people. This study uses a qualitative approach with the grounded theory method. This research results show a collective awareness of Durkheim's understanding that characterizes mechanical solidarity; in the case of philanthropy in Indonesia, it is at the intersection of mechanical and organic solidarity. The strengthening of generosity can be explained from the theory of social facts that there are non-material social facts that shape the spirit of the Indonesian people's philanthropic movement, namely generosity and collective awareness that characterize mechanical solidarity in rural areas that occurs in modern society with organic solidarity.

Article History:

Submitted : 01-10-2021

Revised : 20-10-2021

Accepted : 30-10-2021

Keywords:

philanthropy, civic education, charity, pandemic, citizens



Introduction

The philanthropic movement requires the spirit of citizens to actively encourage individuals to give their time and commitment to the communities in which they live (Daly, 2011). However, individual initiatives are not enough due to the challenges of large and complex problems in the field. In addition, the absence of institutional infrastructure and policies from stakeholders encourages the need for effective and targeted efforts from various components of philanthropy actors and supporters in Indonesia to collect, unite and strengthen joint actions of civil society in facing the challenges of social, humanitarian, and environmental development in the country. Therefore, philanthropy works to solve social problems the community faces and helps provide opportunities for society.

The importance of maintaining the philanthropic tradition by conducting strict supervision for philanthropic institutions. The philanthropic movement is also not free from criticism. Many criticisms have been leveled that philanthropy cannot effectively fight poverty for various reasons. Such funds fall prey to corrupt bureaucrats. Poor people will waste money or become dependent on donations rather than providing for themselves. (Weidel, 2016). Underwood also conveyed a criticism that highlighted the struggle of philanthropy, which has been synonymous with fighting for vulnerable communities but has not created the resilience needed to survive the Covid-19 pandemic. (Underwood, 2020). Weidel's pessimism towards philanthropic institutions is a challenge for accountability and philanthropic creative ideas to create a movement that means empowerment rather than just a symptom.

Individual initiatives are not enough due to the challenges of large and complex problems in the field. In addition, the absence of institutional infrastructure and policies from stakeholders encourages the need for effective and targeted efforts from various components of philanthropy actors and supporters in Indonesia to collect, unite and strengthen joint actions of civil society in facing the challenges of social, humanitarian, and environmental development in the country. The

future of philanthropy is possible but will depend on a stable political and economic situation, support from the state, and the presence of a robust civil society (Fauzia, 2017). In a micro perspective, the philanthropic movement pays attention to individuals like donors and sees their decision to give as shaped by the networks and norms of the local social context in which they live. This perspective has emphasized the relational nature of charitable giving that philanthropic behavior depends on their engagement in dynamic and changing social relationships. (Barman, 2017).

From the view above, the contribution of citizens both individually and then develops to form communities and institutions institutionalized regularly in the philanthropic movement can be formulated into a socio-cultural movement for citizenship. Philanthropy is understood context social basis and social capital of the Indonesian people in facing the unfinished pandemic.

Method

This research used the grounded theory to find patterns/models of philanthropic reinforcement in tradition, activities, and movements to build the socio-cultural dimension of citizenship. In other words, this research aimed to reveal the model of philanthropy that could strengthen the socio-cultural building of citizenship and contribute to the curricular, academic, and socio-cultural domains of civic education in Indonesia.

Data in this study were obtained from interviews and analysis of documents related to the philanthropic movement in Indonesia. For analysis, researchers divide data sources into two categories, namely: first, printed materials (library), including textbooks, curriculum documents, journals, papers, clippings, newspapers, tabloids, and others that related to civic education to develop a global vision of young citizens; second, the source of respondents (human resources), selected using purposive sampling method, which consists of philanthropists, stakeholders, and academics.

Data analysis was performed using ATLAS.ti software. This software includes a program of CAQDAS (*Computer-Aided Qualitative Data Analysis Software*) or QDA software (*Qualitative Data Analysis Software*). The developer of this ATLAS.ti software is Thomas Muhr from Germany. In German, ATLAS.ti is abbreviated as *Archiv fur Technik, Lebenswelt, Alltags Sprache (Archive of Technology, Lifeworld and Everyday Language)* (Friese, 2019). The version used in this study is ATLAS.ti version 8 with a government license.

Result and Discussion

Philanthropy in Indonesia is interesting to study, especially amid a pandemic, because of its solid religious base, especially Islam. History proves that philanthropy is close to Islamic values. The development of religious, philanthropic traditions, especially Islam in Indonesia, is due to several factors. First, the economy has improved in the last decade, even though the ongoing pandemic is currently battering it. Second, the increase in the number of the middle class who gain more access to religious forums, such as recitations and other collective worship practices in the workplace. The intensity of the religious forum is an excellent social capital for them in consolidating social activities, including philanthropy.

Three main concepts related to religious philanthropy, especially Islam, are (1) a religious obligation, (2) religious morality, and (3) social justice. The first concept becomes a general guide, the second concept relates to social morality. The last concept touches on the core goal of philanthropy and religion itself, namely social justice. There are two forms of piety in spiritual human beings: individual piety, vertical between the individual and God. Second, social piety manifests individual piety in mutual help in kindness with others in various contexts.

The concept of mutual help in local cultural and religious traditions has been ingrained. Its development was systematically fostered and transformed into a philanthropic institution. It means that the strength of local and religious traditions is further strengthened that it is not only individual religious values and beliefs that motivate philanthropy (Cnaan et al., 1993; Norenzayan & Shariff, 2008), religious context (Borgonovi, 2008; Lim & MacGregor, 2012; Ruiters & De Graaf, 2006), in the form of social piety. The religiosity of citizens is directly proportional to the spirit of generosity. It can transmit that spirit, as found by Lim & MacGregor (2012), that if non-religious people have close religious affiliations, they are more likely to volunteer for religious and non-religious causes. The tradition of local cultural roots is strong in shaping the spirit of generosity. However, religious inspiration seems to be the dominant factor in the tradition of generosity (Latief, 2013a). It can be read by borrowing Durkheim's view (2006) that religion is genuinely social. Durkheim's view of religion is centered on his claim that religion is very social. Religion is the most valuable part of all social life in every culture. For Durkheim, religion is not just a list of doctrines on supernatural matters; religion is not teaching contained in manuscripts but a social phenomenon that reflects the social solidarity of society. Religious philanthropy is an identity attached to the background color it carries. As a result, the three informants said that there is a tendency for this religious-based philanthropic movement to be exclusive in its implementation. Religious philanthropy in the Indonesian context is attached to the tradition of charity/charity with a direct giving pattern which can be seen immediately. The impact seen is to relieve symptoms only and is oriented to the short term. In the current development, there is a development in its utilization.

The social basis of philanthropy in Indonesia, when viewed from the genealogy discussed in the previous section, comes from rooted local traditions and culture and the religious values of the community. These two social bases are deeply rooted in the practice of philanthropy. Social resources and social capital are quite good in the community. The two bases provide a pattern of community-based philanthropy developing in Indonesia.

By borrowing Marx's term, the social basis of philanthropy is related to the movement of economic resources, or at least these resources can be converted economically. In Marx's view (Kambali, 2020), the basis is the production of the driving material in transforming the old society into the new society of human history. Marx's view that positions material production as a determinant of social change is known as "economic determinism," which is a theory which states that the dominant "forces" in social life and social change are economic life.

Social generosity, which is the social basis rooted in religious traditions and values, gives birth to social actions, especially amid a pandemic to help relatives affected by this pandemic. The reason is simple, although it is the government's responsibility, cooperation/synergy from various parties is beneficial.

The importance of the basis of religion in social action is underscored in the study of religion and collective action more broadly, finding that religion and religious communities often play an important role in various social movements and advocacy efforts, including many that can have a major impact on the lives of the poor (Nepstad & Williams, 2007; Rogers & Konieczny, 2018; Smith, 1996; Williams, 2003). So this social generosity becomes the capital for the socio-cultural development of citizenship in Indonesia. There is a shift in meaning and practice in subsequent developments, but the substance is still the same. Giving is not only about money but also willing to share, namely the desire to share and the desire to give. It shows that there are values of mutual help and social generosity, which are the core culture of the community

The pattern of relationships in social penetration theory explain philanthropy in the context of social relations between citizens, the motives of donors, and donor self-disclosure. The bond between citizens is how volunteer activities can develop into philanthropy. At a level above

superficial, individuals have social and spiritual values, one of which is altruism. Altruism is a free movement driven by altruist motivation to promote friendship, relationships, and good character (Kurzban et al., 2015; Piliavin & Charng, 1990; Seglow, 2002). This unpaid movement to give something to someone else is different from the theory of gift called the great transfer of an object of social value with asynchronous reciprocal guarantees (there is a time interval between giving and reciprocating) and in-kind (Heins et al., 2018; Mauss, 2002).

Furthermore, this social basis gave birth to solidarity as part of philanthropy. Solidarity is a feeling of solidarity that embodies the spirit of citizens who have a great desire to help others, the spirit of citizen donation with love, empathy, mutual help, and the spirit of mutual cooperation. This form of solidarity was transformed into a digital form following existing developments in subsequent developments.

Solidarity is a philanthropic social capital that allows people to be more involved and play a role in suitable activities as part of their social piety. It is also human nature to be socially involved as a solidarity consciousness. Social capital is a resource that comes from social relations that allows various subjects, as individuals and group organizations, to coordinate actions to obtain benefits and achieve desired results (Payne et al., 2011; Suseno, 2018). Social capital becomes a bond for individuals and groups in their networks to provide broader access and opportunities because of their relationships and position in the social structure (Burt & Burzynska, 2017).

The relationship between social capital and civil society is mutually beneficial. Social capital refers to normative values and beliefs in the practice of daily life of the community and society as a vehicle for that social practice (Hyden, 1997). In other words, social capital is the norm and its values. At the same time, civil society is the medium to instill and cultivate those norms and values (Latief, 2013b).

Social capital also develops because of the contribution of religious positions in the socio-political context. As the success of strengthening civil society, which is influenced by the state's attitude, religion-based social capital is closely related to the state because religion-based social capital often becomes strong. However, other political situations can weaken (Latief, 2013b). The observations of Candland (2000) in Pakistan, Thailand, Sri Lanka, and Indonesia, which have relatively the same religious configuration of the population but differ in their positioning of religion and state. According to him, in Pakistan and Indonesia, most of the population is Muslim. However, Islam is the state religion in Pakistan, but this is not the case in Indonesia. Meanwhile, in Thailand and Sri Lanka, most of the population adheres to Buddhism. However, Buddhism is made the state religion in Thailand, unlike in Sri Lanka (Candland, 2000; Latief, 2013b).

The social capital of the Indonesian people by positioning Islam not as a state religion, one of which is mutual cooperation as a form of solidarity that has been rooted socio-culturally for centuries. The Indonesian people's socio-cultural roots make the philanthropic movement grow, develop, and spread during a pandemic. Philanthropy is closely related to a sense of caring, solidarity and social relations between people in society (Latief, 2013a). In its development, the concept of philanthropy has been interpreted more broadly, related to the charity activity itself and how the effectiveness of activity of "giving", both material and non-material, can encourage collective change in society (Latief, 2013a).

Philanthropy is a form of social capital that binds people together in the spirit of supporting the welfare of others (Putnam, 2001). According to Putnam's theory, religious philanthropy provides two social capitals: religious participation and philanthropy itself. Religious participation is a binding social capital, inward-looking and exclusive, and crucial for strengthening society (Fauzia, 2017).

Philanthropy bridges social capital that encompasses various social groups and is an important factor in the development of human resources.

Conclusion

Philanthropy awareness arises because citizens' socio-cultural existence through the philanthropic movement. There is a role that citizens can play in realizing their existence or their roles as citizens. The implication is that the relationship between citizens, the state, and philanthropy allows for the emergence of voluntary movements through philanthropy when the state does not show a good ability to promote people's welfare. The community tries to complement the unfinished state policies. The existence of citizens through philanthropy shows its role in the socio-cultural dimension of citizens in dealing with the pandemic.

References

- Barman, E. (2017). The social bases of philanthropy. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 43(1), 271–290. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-soc-060116-053524>
- Borgonovi, F. (2008). Divided we stand, united we fall: Religious pluralism, giving, and volunteering. *American Sociological Review*, 73(1), 105–128. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240807300106>
- Burt, R. S., & Burzynska, K. (2017). Chinese entrepreneurs, social networks, and guanxi. *Management and Organization Review*, 13(2), 1–37. <https://doi.org/10.1017/mor.2017.6>
- Candland, C. (2000). Faith as social capital: Religion and community development in Southern Asia. *Political Sciences*, 33(3), 355–374. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1004857811117>
- Christou, P., Hadjielias, E., & Farmaki, A. (2019). Reconnaissance of philanthropy. *Annals of Tourism Research*, 78(September), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.annals.2019.102749>
- Cnaan, R. A., Kasternakis, A., & Wineburg, R. J. (1993). Religious people, religious congregations, and volunteerism in human service: Is there a link? *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 503(1), 122–136. <https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1177/089976409302200104>
- Daly, S. (2011). Philanthropy, the big society and emerging philanthropic relationships in the UK. *Public Management Review*, 13(8), 1077–1094. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2011.619063>
- Durkheim, E. (2006). *Sejarah agama (The elementary forms of the religious life)* (I. R. Muzir (Penerj.); 3 ed.). IRCiSoD.
- Fauzia, A. (2017). Islamic philanthropy in Indonesia: Modernization, islamization, and social justice. *Austrian Journal of South-East Asian Studies*, 10(2), 223–236. <https://doi.org/10.14764/10.ASEAS-2017.2-6>
- Friese, S. (2019). *Qualitative data analysis with ATLAS.ti*. SAGE Publishing.
- Heins, V. M., Unrau, C., & Avram, K. (2018). Gift-giving and reciprocity in global society: Introducing Marcel Mauss in international studies. *Journal of International Political Theory*, 14(2), 126–144. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1755088218757807>
- Hyden, G. (1997). Civil society, social capital, and development: Dissection of a complex discourse. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, 32(1), 3–30. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02696304>
- Kambali, M. (2020). Pemikiran Karl Marx tentang struktur masyarakat (Dialektika infrastruktur dan suprastruktur). *Jurnal Pemikiran dan Penelitian Ekonomi Islam*, 8(2), 63–80. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/332489-pemikiran-karl-marx-tentang-struktur-mas-fb1b694e.pdf>
- Kurzban, R., Burton-Chellew, M. N., & West, S. A. (2015). The evolution of altruism in humans. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 66(1), 575–599. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev-psych-010814-015355>

- Latief, H. (2013a). Agama dan pelayanan sosial: Interpretasi dan aksi filantropi dalam tradisi Muslim dan Kristen di Indonesia. *Religi*, IX(2), 174–189.
- Latief, H. (2013b). *Politik filantropi di Indonesia*. Ombak.
- Lim, C., & MacGregor, C. A. (2012). Religion and volunteering in context: Disentangling the contextual effects of religion on voluntary behavior. *American Sociological Review*, 77(5), 747–779. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0003122412457875>
- Mauss, M. (2002). *The gift: The form and reason for exchange in archaic societies*. Taylor & Francis e-Library.
- Milner, A. (2018). *Lanskap global filantropi* (Filantropi Indonesia (Penerj.)). Worldwide Initiatives for Grantmaker Support (WINGS).
- Nepstad, S. E., & Williams, R. H. (2007). Religion in rebellion, resistance, and social movements. In J. A. Beckford & N. J. Demerath (Ed.), *The SAGE handbook of the sociology of religion* (hal. 419–437). SAGE Publications Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781848607965.n21>
- Norenzayan, A., & Shariff, A. F. (2008). The origin and evolution of religious prosociality. *Science*, 322(5898), 58–62. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1158757>
- Payne, G. T., Moore, C. B., Griffis, S. E., & Autry, C. W. (2011). Multilevel challenges and opportunities in social capital research. *Journal of Management*, 37(2), 491–520. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206310372413>
- Piliavin, J. A., & Charng, H. (1990). Altruism: A review of recent. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 16, 27–65. <https://doi.org/10.1146/annurev.so.16.080190.000331>
- Putnam, R. D. (2001). *Bowling alone: The collapse and revival of American community*. Simon and Schuster.
- Rogers, M., & Konieczny, M. E. (2018). Does religion always help the poor? Variations in religion and social class in the west and societies in the global south. *Palgrave Communications*, 4(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1057/s41599-018-0135-3>
- Ruiter, S., & De Graaf, N. D. (2006). National context, religiosity, and volunteering: Results from 53 countries. *American Sociological Review*, 71(2), 191–210. <https://doi.org/10.1177/000312240607100202>
- Seglow, J. (2002). Altruism and freedom. *Critical Review of International Social and Political Philosophy*, 5(4), 145–163. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13698230410001702782>
- Smith, C. (1996). *Disruptive religion: The force of faith in social-movement activism*. Routledge.
- Suseno, Y. (2018). Disruptive innovation and the creation of social capital in Indonesia's urban communities. *Asia Pacific Business Review*, 24(2), 174–195. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13602381.2018.1431251>
- Underwood, S. (2020). *Building a better normal: What now for philanthropy?* The Philanthropy Workshop. <https://www.tpw.org/building-a-better-normal-what-now-for-philanthropy/>
- Weidel, T. (2016). Philanthropy, cosmopolitanism, and the benefits of giving directly. *Journal of Global Ethics*, 12(2), 170–186. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17449626.2016.1196461>
- Williams, R. H. (2003). Religious social movements in the public sphere. In *Handbook of the Sociology of Religion* (hal. 315–330). Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511807961.022>