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ABSTRACT

Introduction: Poverty alleviation of marginalized communities, especially for rural areas, uses a rural area development strategy. Law Number 6 of 2014 concern of Village Autonomy, the nature and leadership style of the Village Head emphasizes sectoral ego, low commitment, no innovation and creativity, and responsibility for development in rural areas as negative symptoms. This is a phenomenon that attracts parties as a contributing factor to the failure of collaborative governance in rural area development.

Theoretical review: This study aims to explain the elements of collaborative governance of IPSPs (independent public services providers) in the development of rural areas. Governance is essentially a process, method, activity and system of cooperative interaction between a number of actors or organizations to manage together (collectivity) to implement policies based on the same goals and interests based on social contract.

Methods: The method used is qualitative research with a descriptive approach. Researchers conducted 4 (four) stages including: a). data collection; b). data condensation; c). data display; d). conclusion: drawing/verifying.

Result and Discussion: The results are the elements of collaborative governance for the development of rural areas have not been carried out optimally. This is due to the sectoral ego of the village government prefers to manage its own village area through village-owned enterprises (BUMDes) than managing the area together in BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar.

Conclusion: The change of BUMDesma management did not bring significant changes and lacked the willingness to produce creative and innovative ideas. In addition, the leadership factor is crucial to be considered.

Keywords: Collaborative Governance IPSPs, Rural Areas, Village Autonomy, Joint Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDesma).

RESUMO

Introdução: A redução da pobreza nas comunidades marginalizadas, especialmente nas zonas rurais, utiliza uma estratégia de desenvolvimento das zonas rurais. A Lei Número 6 de 2014 preocupa-se com a Autonomia da Aldeia,
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a natureza e o estilo de liderança do Chefe da Aldeia enfatiza o ego sectorial, o baixo compromisso, a falta de inovação e criatividade e a responsabilidade pelo desenvolvimento nas áreas rurais como sintomas negativos. Este é um fenômeno que atrai os partidos como factor que contribui para o fracasso da governação colaborativa no desenvolvimento das zonas rurais.

**Revisão teórica:** Este estudo visa explicar os elementos da governança colaborativa dos IPSPs (provedores independentes de serviços públicos) no desenvolvimento das áreas rurais. A governança é essencialmente um processo, método, atividade e sistema de interacção cooperativa entre vários actores ou organizações para gerir em conjunto (coletividade) a implementação de políticas baseadas nos mesmos objectivos e interesses baseados no contrato social.


**Resultado e Discussão:** Os resultados são que os elementos da governança colaborativa para o desenvolvimento das zonas rurais não foram executados de forma óptima. Isto deve-se ao ego sectorial do governo da aldeia que prefere gerir a sua própria área da aldeia através de empresas pertencentes à aldeia (BUMDes) do que gerir a área em conjunto no BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar.

**Conclusão:** A mudança na gestão do BUMDesma não trouxe mudanças significativas e faltou disposição para produzir ideias criativas e inovadoras. Além disso, o fator liderança é crucial a ser considerado.

**Palavras-chave:** IPSPs de Governança Colaborativa, Áreas Rurais, Autonomia da Aldeia, Empresas Conjuntas de Propriedade da Aldeia (BUMDesma).

**RESUMEN**

**Introducción:** El alivio de la pobreza de las comunidades marginadas, especialmente en las zonas rurales, utiliza una estrategia de desarrollo de zonas rurales. La Ley Número 6 de 2014, que se refiere a la autonomía de las aldeas, la naturaleza y el estilo de liderazgo del jefe de aldea, enfatiza como síntomas negativos el ego sectorial, el bajo compromiso, la falta de innovación y creatividad y la responsabilidad por el desarrollo en las zonas rurales. Este es un fenómeno que atrae a los partidos como factor que contribuye al fracaso de la gobernanza colaborativa en el desarrollo de las zonas rurales.

**Revisión teórica:** Este estudio tiene como objetivo explicar los elementos de la gobernanza colaborativa de los IPSP (proveedores independientes de servicios públicos) en el desarrollo de las zonas rurales. La gobernanza es esencialmente un proceso, método, actividad y sistema de interacción cooperativa entre una serie de actores u organizaciones para gestionar juntos (colectividad) la implementación de políticas basadas en los mismos objetivos e intereses basados en el contrato social.


**Resultado y Discusión:** Los resultados muestran que los elementos de la gobernanza colaborativa para el desarrollo de las zonas rurales no se han llevado a cabo de manera óptima. Esto se debe a que el ego sectorial del gobierno de la aldea prefiere gestionar su propia zona a través de empresas de propiedad de la aldea (BUMDes) que gestionar la zona en conjunto en BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar.

**Conclusión:** El cambio de dirección de BUMDesma no trajo cambios significativos y careció de voluntad para producir ideas creativas e innovadoras. Además, es fundamental tener en cuenta el factor liderazgo.

**Palabras clave:** IPSP de Gobernanza Colaborativa, Zonas Rurales, Autonomía de las Aldeas, Empresas Conjuntas e Propiedad De Las Aldeas (BUMDesma).
1 INTRODUCTION

The development of rural areas as a regional development step at the village level to overcome poverty and improve welfare that occurs in countries facing various challenges nationally and globally, the reform in rural areas, the integration of minority groups into the national scope, decentralization provides new responsibilities to the regional level. (Singh, 2009); (Frohlich et al., 2013); (Nguyen et al., 2014); (Park & Lee, 2019); (Yilong, 2013); (Chen, 2009); (Michele et al., 2023); (Martínez-Jauregui et al., 2023); (Del Mármol & Vaccaro, 2020); (Pinto-Correia et al., 2021); Chambers, R. (1983)

In Indonesia, the presence of Law No. 6/2014 on village autonomy is a national policy and governance of village governance. This village law positions the village administrative area as the frontline of Indonesia's development with the principle of diversity, prioritizing the principle of village recognition and subsidiarity. The village development paradigm places village economic institutions through Joint Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDesma) which are expected to be able to massively encourage and mobilize the village economy by optimizing all the superior potential of each village. However, based on the facts in the field, it is not supported by the leadership style of the village head who still prioritizes their respective village sectoral egos, lack of commitment, innovation and creativity, and no responsibility for the development change movement in rural areas. Therefore, it is important to build a shared understanding of the diverse interests and contributions of stakeholders, invest in open ongoing communication and manage relationships between stakeholders clearly, (Kuruvilla, Shyama & Collegues, 2018: 8).

The main strategy for developing rural areas in BUMDesma with collaborative governance between the public sector and the private sector includes inter-village cooperation and village cooperation with the private sector to build and develop the economy in rural areas as steps to alleviate poverty in the village area. The concept of cross-sector collaboration, both the public sector and the private sector form a combination as a strategy in the development of rural areas in BUMDesma with inter-village cooperation, as stated by Forrer et al., (2014:9) "Cross-Sector Collaboration is the voluntary linking of organizations in two or more sectors in a common effort that involves a sharing of
information, resources, activities, capabilities, risks and there are some commonalities among the sectors, there are also significant differences.

"in their missions, how they operate, to whom they are accountable, and how they measure success". The theory above explains cross-sector collaboration, both public and private in the development of rural areas in BUMDesma with cooperation between villages and the private sector. So that collaborative governance in the development of business units to develop the economy of rural communities is important to note, because with increasing competitiveness and economic growth, and the development of the village area as the lowest unit of government area will have a positive impact nationally. As the theory of Lank, (2006) the importance of the relationship that an organization chooses with other organizations is a strategic choice as much as the investment they make to obtain products, improve services, and develop skills to face challenges and competition.

Based on the background description above, the purpose of this study is to determine the application of collaborative governance elements of IPSPs (independent public services providers) in the development of rural areas in BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar, Ngantang sub-district, Malang district.

2 THEORETICAL STUDY

2.1 COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE IPSPS (INDEPENDENT PUBLIC SERVICES PROVIDERS)

Governance as 'there is still confusion about the conceptualization of the term'. Conceptually, the definition of Governance explained by Chhotray & Stoker, (2009), namely:

"Governance is about the rules of collective decision-making in settings where there are a plurality of actors or organizations and where no formal control system can dictate the terms of the relationship between these actors and organizations".

The definition of Governance above emphasizes that decision-making regulations are carried out collectively by actors without a system that regulates the relationship between these actors. Meanwhile, the World Development Report (WDR), (2017) explains "Governance is the process through which state and non-state actors interact to design and
implement policies within a given set of formal and informal rules that shape and are shaped by power". Furthermore, Guo & Jiang, (2017) explain that:

"Governance is the mechanism through which various interest groups, public sectors, and private sectors conduct horizontal consultation, cooperate, manage, and make collective decisions concerning certain public interests in the public domain. The essence of governance is more like a social contract than the government’s ruling, controlling, and administering".

Some of the above definitions can be analyzed that Governance is essentially a process, method or method, activity and system of cooperative interaction between a number of actors or organizations to manage together (collectivity) to implement policies based on the same goals and interests based on social contract. Thus the term Governance is essentially a process, method or method, activity and system of cooperative interaction between a number of actors or organizations to manage together (collectivity) to implement policies based on the same interests based on social contract. As stated by Bevir, (2010) which explains the theories in Governance in table 1

### Table 1
**Governance Theories**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concept of rationality</th>
<th>Rational Choice Theory</th>
<th>Institutionalism</th>
<th>System Theory</th>
<th>Regulation Theory</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Source of coordination</td>
<td>Preferences and Incentives</td>
<td>Rules and norms</td>
<td>Autopoiesis</td>
<td>Temporary effect of regime of regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explanation of the new Governance</td>
<td>Electoral competition and/or bureau shaping</td>
<td>Social learning and/or policy transfer</td>
<td>Functional Differentiation</td>
<td>Post-Fordism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Network analysis</td>
<td>Actor-centered</td>
<td>Power dependence</td>
<td>Self-organizing System</td>
<td>Dialectic (strategic relational)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examples:
- a) General
- b) The new governance

Source: Bevir, Mark (2010: 41)
The table above shows governance from various theoretical perspectives. In governance, to create a system of interaction, collaboration is needed (Katzenstein & Brice, 2018). The need to build relationships between institutions and individuals is critical to the success of collaborative projects. Cross-sector collaboration can take many forms, ranging from *ad hoc* interactions, to complex partnerships or networks brought together with contracts or other idealized agreements. Analytically, Woldesenbet, (2018) describes cross-sectoral collaboration as a new partnership that has complete power, resources, ideas, principles, authority and skills collectively to deal with common problems. So according to Norris Tirrel & Clay (2010) cited by Forrer et al., (2014) grouped objective strategies into 3 (three) impacts of collaboration:

a) Deliverables and outcomes: This might include enhancing operations, attaining goals, or achieving better overall results;

b) Increased capacity and competence: This might result in greater capacity for individuals, the organization, or the Community;

c) New resources and opportunities: This might lead to new funding opportunities for new markets or program areas and the potential for further cross-sector collaboration.

For the 3 (three) impact strategies in a collaboration, it is actually the private sector organizations that initiate the collaboration strategy. At the same time, dynamics also occur within public sector organizations and the non-profit sector. Norris Tirrell & Clay (2010) cited by Forrer et al., (2014) there are 5 (five) stages of the process or "life cycle collaboration" collaboration implementation strategy, namely:

a) Exploration: Setting the stage for strategic collaboration;

b) Formation and implementation: Shaping the strategic collaboration;

c) Growth and evaluation: Strengthening the collaboration;

d) Maturity: Achieving results, achieving shared value, making a difference;

e) Endings or renewal: Letting go when you have achieved your objectives or renewing the collaboration with existing or new partners.

The concept of *independent public services providers* (IPSPs) provides a new option for collaborative governance. According to Forrer et al., (2014) describes IPSPs, namely: "IPSPs as self-directed entities composed of businesses, nonprofit organizations (often referred to as nongovernmental organizations), and governmental units that collaborate in the production or delivery of public goods or services". IPSPs are a form of *collaborative governance where the* public sector and private sector independently produce goods and
services for public service. IPSPs have different characteristics from collaborative public-private partnerships, partnerships and networks. Therefore the combination of the three in IPSPs as different collaborative partners in governance, namely:

a) The multi-sector circle also describes organizations that do not provide public services and are not independent, such as non-profit institutions and businesses;
b) The public service circle includes organizations such as the central government, provincial governments, and local governments, as well as various quasi-governmental organizations within the government hierarchy that provide services to the public that are not multi-sectoral in nature;
c) Independent circles include for-profit organizations and non-profit organizations providing goods and services within a sector, such as companies that have the freedom to make their own decisions to sell goods and services for profit operating in the private sector.

The shape of the circles - the circles of the combination of the three are in the image below:

**Figure 1**
*Independent Public Service Providers (IPSPs)*

![Image of IPSP models](image)

*Source: Forrer et al., (2014)*

Figure 1 above provides an explanation of IPSPs activities in the black color image in the middle of the circle from the area diagram of the three characteristics can be combined into one. The characteristics of IPSPs according to Forrer et al., (2014), namely:

a) *IPSPs are largely self-directed;* acting independently. They therefore have the
freedom to confront problems, deliver public goods and services that do not fit the perspective espoused by government agencies;

b) *IPSPs comprise multiple stakeholders*; have diverse perspectives and accommodate each of these perspectives and different interests;

c) *IPSPs provide public goods and services*; providing services in government areas by interacting directly with the public and delivering public services expected by the government by providing good choices.

The above characteristics of IPSPs show great discretion and authority in determining the methods and types of services provided and have characteristics outside the government framework. Important elements to realize the governance of IPSPs collaboration according to Forrer et al., (2014) as shown below

**Figure 2**
*Elements of IPSPs Collaboration*

![Figure 2: Elements of IPSPs Collaboration](image)

*Source: Forrer et al., (2014)*

Figure 2. above regarding the elements of *collaborative governance* of IPSPs can be explained as follows, namely:
2.1.1 Autonomy

IPSPs have flexible authority from the government. The role of IPSPs provides the freedom to involve various actors, both outside the scope of government authority and the government's own authority.

2.1.2 Mutuality

All IPSPs actors should benefit from participation in collaboration. Collaboration requires more time and effort than acting unilaterally...

2.1.3 Innovation

IPSPs' strength is innovation. This can provide a creative solution that would never come from a government agency. Of course, not all ideas and innovations will be successful, but IPSPs are better able to risk failure and embrace innovative, systemic thinking and creative problem solving.

2.1.4 Sharing Expertise and Resources

Governments have expertise and resources that benefit IPSPs and influence governments to approach IPSPs to address certain issues, including providing certain legitimacy, so government support is beneficial to IPSPs.

2.1.5 Allocating Risk

The government has few risks with IPSPs. However, there are some rational risks that the government takes to support IPSPs activities.

2.1.6 Measuring Performance

IPSPs should have mechanisms to measure their performance operations. Measures may include output measures; outcome measures, and organizational measures.
The description of the six elements of collaborative governance of IPSPs above has advantages and disadvantages, among others:

### 2.1.7 Pros of IPsps for Government

a) **Additional resources.** IPSPs receive funding from foundations, donors as operational costs. Where the government is limited by budgetary capacity;
b) **Political Sensitivities.** New approaches to public service delivery can create political sensitivities;
c) **Long-Term View.** IPSPs collaboration for the long term;
d) **Social Entrepreneurship.** Private organizations find new business opportunities; non-profit organizations want to expand their member base, as well as with their impact. To achieve these goals IPSPs look for innovative solutions and make something different happen;
e) **Adaptation and Change.** Businesses must change and modify approaches when something is not working correctly;
f) **Leadership.** IPSPs have the support and active involvement of leaders in the community.

### 2.1.8 Shortcomings of IPsps for the Government

a) **Difficult Communications.** The decentralized organization of some existing IPSPs can make it difficult for governments to communicate and engage members effectively;
b) **Unpopular Politics.** The nature of IPSPs does not necessarily conform to the positions of political parties or elected officials;
c) **Impermanence.** There are few things that unite IPSPs, other than the conviction of its members and their commitment to a cause;
d) **Mission drift.** IPSPs are free to choose a mission and the public services they provide. The mission can change at any time, if they feel the need (Forrer et al., 2014).
2.2 VILLAGE-OWNED ENTERPRISES (BUMDES) AND VILLAGE TRADITIONS

The paradigm of "Building Villages", the main basis for the location of the establishment area of Joint BUMDes or cooperation between 2 (two) BUMDes or more is rural areas, so that the Government, private sector, donor agencies and Villages can collaborate in partnerships on a larger business scale. As described in table 2.

**Table 2**

*Paradigm of Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes) 'Village Building' and 'Village Building'*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Location base</th>
<th>Enterprises (Development)</th>
<th>Desa Membangun (Village Development)</th>
<th>Building Villages (Rural Development)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Location base</strong></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Economy</td>
<td>Rural Area</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Destination</strong></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>and business services</td>
<td>Inter-village cooperation and business services inter-village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authority</strong></td>
<td>Based on Local Authority Village-scale</td>
<td>Inter-village Local Authority in collaboration with the Authority Government and local government</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Procedure</strong></td>
<td>Village Meeting</td>
<td>Inter-Village Consultative Meeting (MAD)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Business Scale</strong></td>
<td>Services (serving) Rental (renting) Trade (trading) Intermediary Services (brokering)</td>
<td>a) Inter-village strategic partnership cooperation b) Business diversification oriented towards financial business (banking) and joint ventures (holding) c) Investment plans with third parties (investors)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Authoritative Institution</strong></td>
<td>Village Government and Village Community</td>
<td>BKAD (Inter-Village Cooperation Agency), consisting of: Village Government, BPD, LKD, other Village institutions, Gender justice-based community leaders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Institutional</strong></td>
<td>Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes); may consist of non-incorporated business units, as well as incorporated business units.</td>
<td>Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes) Joint Cooperation between 2 (two) BUMDes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Surya Putra (2015: 24-25)*
The objectives of the formation of BUMDes will have a significant impact on the community, one of the benefits of BUMDes owned by rural communities, including the following:

d) The Village Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBDes) can be used as business capital for the village;

e) Villages can explore potential, utilize, manage, develop to become economic business units;

f) Bringing new business and employment opportunities, thereby reducing the flow of urbanization;

g) Increase the village's original income, so that village development can be financed by the village (village independence).

The expectations and benefits of BUMDes are substantially to provide and improve the welfare and social justice of the community as subjects and objects in development at the village level, especially in rural areas by reducing the poverty rate which has been dominated by village communities.

2.3 RURAL AREA DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Rural development is generally defined as a general development program carried out in rural areas (Sutiyo et al., 2017: 17). Rural development policies and strategies are carried out to improve the conditions of rural communities. The objectives of development policy are in accordance with the needs and desires of the community, as well as policy steps that are carried out according to their interests and should be carried out by the government to bring significant changes. One form of development goals to achieve growth with equity seen from 4 (four) dimensions, according to Singh, (2009: 103) among others, namely: 1) Quality of life of citizens; 2) Productive job creation; 3) Regional balance; 3) Independence.

Rural development, according to the theory of Sutiyo et al. (2017:17) 3 (three) main elements of the concept of rural development, namely:

1) The multi-sector program covers not only agriculture, but also infrastructure, microfinance, environment, human resources and so on;

2) The goal of village development is to improve the standard of living of rural communities, which includes income, housing, education, health and access to other public services;
3) Although rural development targets rural communities as a whole, most references agree that it should give priority to the poorest groups.

3 METHODS

This research uses a type of qualitative research with a descriptive approach where this research is generally used for research on community life, history, behavior, functional organizations, social activities and others (Corbin & Strauss, 2007). as stated by Lincoln & Guba, (1985); (Islami, 2001); (Creswell, 2009) namely: Descriptive research belongs to the family of naturalistic research which includes phenomenological research, hermeneutic, symbolic interactionism, ethnomethodology, ethnography, field studies, case studies, descriptive, subjective, naturalistic, constructivistic, grounded and so on which are distinguished from quantitative research.

For the focus of this research, namely: the application of collaborative governance elements of IPSPs in the development of rural areas in BUMDesma in Ngantang sub-district, Malang Regency using Forrer et al.’s theory (2014). The data analysis technique used in this research uses an interactive model analysis to draw conclusions from the data described, the researchers conducted 4 (four) stages including: a). Data Collection; b). Data Condensation; c). Data Display; d). Conclusion: drawing / verifying, at this stage the researcher carries out activities simultaneously together with the display and data consideration stages, but the maturation effort is carried out when the data display is considered sufficient for a while, as well as the previous activity. If in the preparation of conclusion drawing it turns out that it is not fully supported from the data display and data condensation, the researcher will return to data collection, data display and data condensation. B. Miles et al. (2014)

4 RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The results of the research and discussion regarding the application of the elements of collaborative governance of IPSPs in the development of rural areas in BUMDesma in Ngantang sub-district, Malang Regency, first, according to the village government, the elements of collaborative governance of IPSPs play an important role in the rural area development program at Selorejo Dam. The results of data analysis show that measuring performance is a very important element in the development of rural areas in the area
around the Selorejo Dam. IPSPs have a mechanism to measure performance operations. Performance measurement can include *output measures; outcome* measures, and organizational measures. For timely measurement is an important aspect of effective organizational performance (Forrer et al., 2014), but *measuring performance of* rural area development in BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar still has minimal results (*outputs*) whose accountability is carried out through the mechanism of inter-village deliberation (MAD) once a year. Meanwhile, *mutual* is the smallest element. This is reasonable considering that the management of rural area development activities in the Ngantang sub-district area is still in its early stages, giving a minimal and uneven impact on the community. The village government has tried to carry out government programs in accordance with the law in accordance with the Articles of Association (AD) of BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar, in Chapter II on Principles and Principles, article 4, regarding the BUMDesma principles, namely: 1). Cooperative; 2). Participative; 3). Emancipative, 4). Transparent; 5) Accountable; 6). Sustainability. These principles are the basis for various parties to implement important elements in IPSPs *collaborative governance* in the development of the Selorejo Dam rural area at BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar.

The village, sub-district, and district governments must synergize in the development of the Selorejo Dam area at BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar whose main objectives are:

1). Optimization of tourism potential in rural areas; 2). Optimization of agropolitan potential to support the Selorejo Dam Ngantang ring tourism area; 3). Efforts to increase the economic capacity of communities in rural development areas; 4). Maintaining and preserving biodiversity and the environment. Meanwhile, 4 (four) villages are directly connected to the Selorejo Dam ring area, namely: Kaumrejo Village, Sumberagung Village, Mulyorejo Village, and Banturejo Village. The natural resource potential of each village can be seen in Table 3 below. All four villages are directly adjacent to the Selorejo Dam. All villages have potential that is well known to many people and can be developed into a tourist area for fisheries, agriculture, or other water tourism.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>District</th>
<th>Village Name</th>
<th>Potential</th>
<th>Commodities</th>
<th>Problems</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Kaumrejo  | Village Tourism, Agriculture  |           | 1. Selorejo Dam Tourism  
2. Thematic Village Tourism  
3. Durian  
4. Taro Chips                     | 1. Inadequate tourist support facilities  
2. Weak promotion (Branding)  
3. Weak public facilities, amenities, and infrastructure  
4. Weak institutional management  
5. Weak Agricultural Human Resources  
6. Lack of agricultural technology tools and utilization  
7. Accessibility to / between clusters |
| Sumberagung| Village Tourism, Agriculture  |           | 1. Selorejo Dam Tourism,  
2. Kraeng Galesong Religious Tourism  
3. Srege Mountain Tourism  
4. Bamboo Forest,  
5. Coffee,                                  | 1. Inadequate tourist support facilities  
2. Weak promotion (Branding)  
3. Weak public facilities, amenities, and infrastructure  
4. Weak institutional management  
5. Poor accessibility to tourist attractions  
6. Weak Agricultural Human Resources  
7. Lack of agricultural technology tools and utilization |
| Mulyorejo | Village Tourism, Agriculture  |           | 1. Selorejo Dam Tourism,  
2. Red Onion  
3. Taro Chips  
4. Cassava Chips  
5. Uceng Krispi                       | 1. Inadequate tourist support facilities  
2. Weak promotion (Branding)  
3. Weak public facilities, amenities, and infrastructure  
4. Weak institutional management  
5. Poor accessibility to tourist attractions  
6. Weak Agricultural Human Resources  
7. Lack of agricultural technology tools and utilization  
8. Lack of irrigation  
9. Lack of capital for farmers  
10. No market as a trading center  |
| Banturejo | Agriculture                   |           | 1. Dairy cows                                                             | 1. Weak public facilities, amenities, and infrastructure  
2. Weak institutional management  
3. Weak Agricultural Human Resources  
4. Lack of agricultural technology tools and utilization  
5. Lack of irrigation  
6. Lack of capital for farmers  
7. No market as a trading center |

Source: Ngantang Sub-district Rural Area Development Plan (2019)

Table 3 above shows the potential and commodities, as well as problems in rural area development. Based on the joint decree of the Kaumrejo Village Head, Mulyorejo Village Head, Banturejo Village Head, and Sumberagung Village Head Number 1 of 2019
concerning the composition of the BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar management, it is established as a forum for managing village needs to improve the economy and income of the village community. The results of the decision are also explained in the Bylaws (ART) of BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar Chapter I on rights and obligations in Article 2, paragraph 2, on matters that must be prepared by the BUMDesma management as follows:

1) Develop and establish a *business plan*;
2) Develop and establish standard operating procedures;
3) Play an active role in providing services to village communities;
4) Provide correct, clear, and honest information about the business services managed.

The 4 (four) rights and obligations above are a form of governance that must be carried out by the BUMDesma management to carry out its activities within the rural area. Furthermore, *secondly*, according to the Malang district government, the important elements in the development of rural areas on average refer to 3 (three) main elements, namely: *mutuality, allocating risk, and sharing expertise and resources*. These 3 (three) important elements in the development of rural areas in Ngantang sub-district require trust and commitment from the leadership of the village heads, as well as other *stakeholders*, as the theory of Ansel, (2012), when institutions and *stakeholders* agree to participate in the collaboration process, they may still be suspicious of each other (Weber et al., 2005). Therefore, collaborative governance may require an active trust-building process. This is not an easy task in situations where stakeholders have antagonistic relationships.

Ansel, (2012) found better results for building *trust* by finding *face to face* interaction as a key component of building positive trust. Leadership is often understood as a critical aspect of this collaborative governance (Ansel & Gash, 2008); (Huxham & Vangen, 2000). As collaboration is often voluntary and stakeholders have diverse perspectives and interests, leadership should facilitate the exchange of perspectives and assist stakeholders in exploring the reciprocity of their interests and concerns.

Other elements can be supporting elements for rural area development, including elements of *autonomy*. The management of BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar is given *autonomy* to develop programs that have been mutually agreed upon for the economic progress of the village community without any intervention from other parties. This autonomy right gives the administrators the freedom to innovate and be creative, so that BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar is able to realize the community's economy.

Based on the Articles of Association (AD) of BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar Chapter III regarding the purpose and objectives of the establishment, namely:
a) Increase the use value of village assets and potential for the benefit of the welfare of the village Community;
b) Improve the village's financial capacity in the exercise of its authority and increase the income of the village community through various economic activities of the village Community;
c) As a forum for organizing micro, small, and medium enterprises in rural communities so that cooperation between villages can be established and developed to improve the welfare of rural communities.

The aims and objectives above the Articles of Association (AD) are in accordance with the autonomy element of collaborative governance in BUMDesma has the freedom to manage based on the potential of natural resources (SDA) and human resources (HR) in the community around the Selorejo Dam area. Each program must refer to the aims and objectives of BUMDesma. The government must oversee the regional development program, so that the objectives are realized. The role of IPSPs provides the freedom to involve actors, both outside the scope of government authority and under the authority of the government itself. This shows that the government cannot be hands-off in the development of rural areas around the Selorejo Dam, Ngantang sub-district, Malang district. Furthermore, in the Articles of Association (AD) in Chapter V about the businesses run include:

a) Livestock and fisheries management and processing of livestock and fisheries products;
b) Management of the natural potential of lakes/dams for the development of fisheries, clean water, tourism, and irrigation;
c) Management of the natural potential of village forests by village communities for the development of tourism villages, research, and conversion;
d) Management of the production potential of rural area superior products;
e) Management of clean water potential to be developed into gallon water services;
f) Management of waste potential through processing compost into fertilizer to meet the needs of farmers;
g) Management of potential durian and coffee nurseries to meet farmers' needs for durian and coffee;
h) Other joint economic business activities according to the potential and interests of the village.
The above business activities show that BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar needs to implement the *mutuality* element of IPSPs. With IPSPs, members can innovate creatively to realize these businesses. One of the strengths of IPSPs is its ability to innovate. It can provide creative solutions that are not available from government agencies. Of course, not all ideas and innovations are successful, but IPSPs is able to risk failure and embrace innovative, creative and systemic thinking.

Then, *thirdly*, according to the village facilitator, it shows important elements, namely: *sharing expertise and resources, autonomy, and mutuality*. These 3 (three) elements must be carried out by the BUMDesma management and related *stakeholders* in managing rural areas in Selorejo Dam. The *sharing expertise and resources* element shows that the legality of the rural area development program already exists, but there is no support from various parties for this program. The potential developed in this rural area has been mapped according to the potential of the village and can be integrated in one area, but the realization has not been realized. In addition, there is no cooperation agreement in the form of a *memorandum of understanding* (Mou) with the Tirta Service Company (PJT) as the owner of the land as the main point of the tourist spot and currently only informal communication. This is different as stated by Forrer et al. (2014) the government has expertise and resources that are beneficial to IPSPs and provide influence on public officials for the approach used by IPSPs to deal with certain problems, including providing legitimacy, so that government support is beneficial to IPSPs, in order to be accepted by constituents. The *autonomy* element shows that BUMDesma has not been operating optimally and is still getting minimal results. The powerlessness of BUMDesma is due to the lack of village government support, especially the budget. In addition, there is no clarity on the authority of each village and district government in implementing the rural area development plan. IPSPs have flexible authority from the government. One of the roles of IPSPs is to have the freedom to involve many actors, both outside the scope of government authority and under the authority of the government itself (Forrer et al., 2014) so that commitment is needed in each village and between villages, not more committed to their own needs.

Furthermore, the *mutuality* element shows that there is no transparency in coordination between village heads due to the domination of one of the village heads, so that it is difficult to develop regional programs that have not benefited the community around the Selorejo Dam. This is different as stated by Forrer et al., (2014) "All actors in IPSPs must benefit from participation in collaboration. Collaboration requires more time and effort than acting unilaterally". Therefore, the main potential in the rural area development program,
namely: Selorejo Dam is surrounded by 4 (four) villages into an area program, but in its realization this area has not run optimally due to mutual suspicion, the quality of central government aid goods does not match the price and there is domination of one village.

**Figure 3**

*Delineation of Selorejo Dam Ring Tourism Area, Ngantang Subdistrict*

Successes in IPSPs can lead to new or revamped government programs to address public problems. As IPSPs seek unique solutions, something that governments do not do, governments should support innovation in IPSPs through pilot project grants and other mechanisms. Regional autonomy provides a great opportunity to be creative in the development of the region at large. Law No. 23/2014 on Regional Government explains that regional autonomy is the right, authority and obligation of autonomous regions to regulate and manage their own government affairs and local community interests within the system of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia. The main principles in regional autonomy are to organize the government in accordance with the authority to regulate and manage government matters determined by law. Conceptually, local government is multi-dimensional. Basically, it is a social entity formed by the same feelings. From a political point of view, it relates to specific local governance by forming a political subdivision of a nation, state or other large political unit. (Muttalib & Akbar Ali Khan, 2013).
Finally, according to the management of BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar, the measuring performance element, followed by 2 (two) other elements, namely: autonomy and allocating risk are important elements. For measuring performance, it shows that there is no common understanding from the village heads and the benefits obtained by BUMDesma have not been maximized and there is no significant performance. Timely performance measurement is an important aspect of effective organizational performance. (Forrer et al., 2014) For the element of autonomy, BUMDesma requires support from Ngantang sub-district as well as the village and community empowerment office (DPMD). For the autonomy element, BUMDesma does not have the authority to manage the budget from the central government and receives in-kind assistance in the form of a playground, worth 1.29 billion and 9 (nine) kiosks worth 900 million. Autonomy in IPSPs is valuable as it allows the organization to address areas that may be difficult for the government to handle (Forrer et al., 2014) So that the tourism awareness group (POKDARWIS) still has a sense of responsibility for the management of this tourist area as one of the state assets even though there is still no attention from the 4 (four) village governments. Then for the risk allocating element shows that BUMDesma is experiencing complex problems. The government as the guarantor of choice for certain obligations, or using its legislative power limits the ability of individuals to take legal action if harmed by IPSPs (J.Forrer et al., 2014). Therefore, the sustainability aspect requires commitment from all relevant parties, including village heads, sub-district and local governments, as well as the community in the area, so that the BUMDesma institution runs well and does not stop in the middle of the road. All parties must be responsible for the development of BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar and must eliminate their egoism for the common interest.

The ability to find solutions to various problems faced is very important for the management of BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar. The ability to find solutions must be creative so that problems are really resolved properly and correctly. Then there needs to be cross-sectoral cooperation so that every problem becomes a shared responsibility. Waldesenbet (2018) describes cross-sector collaboration as a new partnership introduced between sectors that have the power, resources, ideas, principles, authority and skills to collectively address common problems (Waldesenbet, 2018). Meanwhile, according to Sorensen et al. (2019) in crisis management, cross-sectoral collaboration exercises as an effort to improve preparedness and develop team integration efforts. The inter-village cooperation agency (BKAD) is a forum for accommodating various aspirations and problems to be solved together. BKAD as the result of an agreement...
between 4 (four) villages, namely Kaumrejo Village, Mulyorejo Village, Banturejo Village, and Sumberagung Village, should be a place to solve various problems in BUMDesma, as well as a medium for various parties to find creative and innovative solutions.

The role of the government is important as a supervisor and guide in the development of rural areas, otherwise the programs prepared will not be implemented. The government is also committed to advancing the area at Selorejo Dam and providing solutions, if there are complicated problems. The government must be able to convince the BUMDesma management, so that there is no suspicion of the government itself. Such beliefs are not altruistic, but the commitment to collaboration can still require psychological changes, especially those who consider their position absolute (Putnam, Burgess, and Royer 2003). As a first step, the shift is what is sometimes called "mutual recognition" (Saarikoski 2000) or "mutual appreciation" (Gray 1989; Plummer and Fitzgibbon 2004). Commitment also poses a complex dilemma. Commitment to a collaborative process requires a willingness to abide by the outcomes of discussions, even if they must go in directions stakeholders are not fully supportive of. Of course, consensus-based oriented collaborative governance greatly reduces risk for stakeholders. But the dynamics of bargaining can lead to unexpected directions, and stakeholders can experience pressure to conform to positions they do not fully embrace (Saarikoski, 2000). It is easy to see why trust is an important element of collaborative governance. Commitment depends on trust that other stakeholders will respect perspectives and interests. It is also easy to see how clear, fair, and transparent procedures are essential for commitment. Before undertaking a process that can go in unpredictable directions, stakeholders should undertake procedures for deliberation and negotiation. A sense of commitment and ownership can be enhanced as engagement increases (Gilliam et. al., 2002).

From the results and discussion above, novelty was found in the form of strategic collaborative processes and actions as follows:

1) Lack of maximum cooperation between the management of BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar, the government, and the community in managing rural areas in Selorejo Dam according to the planned program. This can be overcome in a way, namely:
   a) Reunification of commitment between the BUMDesma board, village government, sub-district and district government to manage the rural area at Selorejo Dam, Ngantang District, Malang Regency;
   b) Conduct socialization to the wider community continuously so that they also actively participate in the development of rural areas with the results of the community’s own
creative efforts;
c) Finding investors to invest in BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar. This requires excellent communication by BUMDesma administrators, especially the BUMDesma chairman himself;
d) Conduct periodic evaluations of the program plans that have been prepared to correct deficiencies and find applicable solutions;
2) Involve creative youth so that they participate in preserving community culture as part of the promotion of area management in the field of cultural tourism. In addition, it is also necessary to manage various culinary tours as a form of a broader community economic development program;
3) There needs to be various trainings attended by anyone who is ready to be coached to participate in the management of rural areas in Selorejo Dam both materially and morally. BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar as a forum for managing various potentials in the Community;
4) Use village funds or area management funds from the central government to build strategic places to become tourist and cultural areas, such as the provision of art markets, street culinary markets, orchards around the Selorejo Dam, fish farms, and so on;
5) The central government must continue to control the management of rural areas on a regular basis, because the rural area development program is a national program under the Ministry of Villages and PDTT. So the central government invites the provincial government to participate in assisting the management of the Selorejo Dam area in a sustainable manner;
6) Academics, scholars, and intellectuals around the Selorejo Dam area must be actively involved in contributing thoughts, ideas, and solutions, as well as promoting BUMDesma Ngantang Bersinar's programs in managing rural areas in Selorejo Dam so that they can advance.
7) Increasing micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs) as part of the economic improvement of the community around the Selorejo Dam area.

5 CONCLUSION

The findings of the research results show that the elements of collaborative governance of rural areas in the programs prepared have not been implemented optimally.
This is due to the ego sectoral nature of the village government, which chooses to manage its own village area in the Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDes) of each village rather than managing rural areas together in the Joint Village-Owned Enterprises (BUMDesma) Ngantang Bersinar for the economic progress of the community around the Selorejo Dam.

Often the change of BUMDesma management does not create significant changes due to the lack of willingness to generate creative and innovative ideas in solving various problems faced. The leadership factor is crucial to be considered immediately. It takes the character and traits of a BUMDesma leader who has capability, credibility, visionary ability to see the various potentials that exist, and is accepted by all parties. In addition, they also have experience in rural area development, at least have the commitment and enthusiasm to learn in rural area governance. Thus, it is necessary to involve higher education institutions to manage rural areas around the Selorejo Dam.
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