

ESTABLISHMENT OF SOLORAYA TOURISM FORUM INSTITUTION: *Strengthening Networks or Sharpening the Contestation of Interest ?*

Jacika Pifi Nugraheni¹, Sudarmo² and Rutiana Dwi Wahyunengseh³
Universitas Sebelas Maret, Jl. Ir. Sutami, Surakarta, Indonesia
Jacika.cikapiff94@student.uns.ac.id, Sudarmo@staff.uns.ac.id, Rutiana@staff.uns.ac.id

Keywords: tourism institutions, perception, network analysis

Abstract: *The institutional formation of the Soloraya Tourism Forum is one of the government's efforts to build tourism in Soloraya in a synergic, integrated and sustainable manner. This study seeks to discuss the perspective of institutional theory related to aspects of network analysis at the empirical level to analyze whether the formation of a soloraya tourism forum is able to strengthen the network or even sharpen the competition of interests among stakeholders. Many institutions emphasize the rules of the game and collective activities for the common or public interests, for this reason this paper focuses on the structure, functions and management of forums to find answers to research questions. The method in this study uses document analysis, literature study and direct observation. The results of the study indicate that the establishment of the soloraya tourism forum institution sharpens competition for interest. Stakeholders' perceptions vary mainly in relation to the implementation of regional autonomy. They tend to stay away from the integrity that can be identified from the policies of each region, so as not to support the success of the Soloraya Tourism Forum. We also describe interactions between stakeholders that are not related to each other.*

1 INTRODUCTION

Tourism has been used as the focus of research in several countries mainly seen from its influence on social, psychological, political and even economic impacts for local communities (Scheyvens, 1999; Briedenham & Wickens, 2004; Chi-Ok oh, 2005; Guccio et al, 2018 ; Wang & Youtsumoto, 2019).

In Indonesia, the contribution of tourism was ranked as the second largest contributor to the country's foreign exchange in 2016, amounting to US \$ 13.568 billion, which was second only to the CPO (oil palm industry) of US \$ 15.965 billion, contribution to GDP by 13% a year 2017, and in terms of employment of 12.4 million people.

The government encourages that opportunity by making national tourism development policies, one of which is the development of Tourism Institutions (Law No.10 of 2009).

Institutional development is important in tourism development, because it is directly related to the network which will later implement all tourism development activities.

In the theoretical domain, from the demand side of geographical connectivity a goal, activity, and budgeting influence the routes of foreign tourists to

visit (Asero, Simona, & Venera, 2015.). This perspective supports that institutional development through inter-regional collaboration has a major influence on tourism development (Pratifritri and Damayanti, 2016.). This encourages the existence of regionalization policies within the framework of tourism institutional development (Warsono, 2009).

Institutional development begins with the establishment of institutions, one of which is the Soloraya tourism forum. The soloraya tourism forum was formed and agreed together with the aim of discussing intensively the development of tourism in Soloraya. Theoretically, the bigger the network the stronger the institution (Mullen & Kochan, 2000; Mosadegh & Behboudi, 2011). However, we have observed that to date, the output of "institutional development results" of Soloraya tourism has not provided significant results. We suspect that they are constrained by regional sector ego (Putranto, 2013).

For this reason, we are challenged to explore further whether the establishment of the Soloraya tourism forum institution can strengthening the network, or even sharpen the contestation of interests.

2 INTERGOVERNMENTAL NETWORK

Intergovernmental Network is an alternative form of institution that has the highest solidarity level in which regions share information and share knowledge among members together. Providing services and a framework for making changes between institutions and allowing decision making and implementation of plans made by the network (Agranoff, 2003; Martinez, 2010).

The pattern of cooperation between regions in the form of intergovernmental networks is different from the pattern of rational cooperation. The Intergovernmental network emphasizes the existence of a network between actors that are interconnected in a system built by awareness of mutual need where the leader only carries out little formal control and without a strict hierarchical structure (contrary to the weberian concept) (O'Toole, 2004; Warsono, 2009; Tang, Chen and Shaol, 2018; Fisk, Good and Nelson, 2019).

To create an institutional form of the intergovernmental network (a forum for coordination between regions) there are 2 (two) strategies that must be carried out, including the strategy of in-game (game management) and outward (network structure).

Table 1: Establishment of the Intergovernmental

	Game Management	Structure Network
IDEA	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agreement 2. Persepsion 3. Bargaining 4. development of the same language 5. Prevention / introduction of ideas 6. pushing reflection 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Refraaming 2. formal policy changes
ACTION	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Selective (de) activating 2. Regulating 3. Conflict management 4. Procedure development encouraging facilities 	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Network (de) activating 2. Institutional reformation 3. changes in internal structure 4. Chages in relation 5. Chaos's management

Network:(PLOD and APEKSI, Final Report on the Model of Cooperation between Regions)

3 METHOD

This study aims to analyze the formation of institutions through tourism forums Soloraya can strengthen the network or even sharpen the contestation of interests. The method used qualitatively is research by obtaining data in the form of words, schemes and drawings as well as research based on postpositive philosophy, used to examine the condition of natural objects (as opposed to experiments) where the researcher is a key instrument (Sugiyono, 2003).

The unit of analysis of this research is the soloraya tourism forum, while the observation unit is the stakeholders involved in the soloraya tourism forum. Stakeholders who are directly involved include: government tourism agency representatives in Surakarta, Boyolali, Sukoharjo, Karanganyar, Wonogiri, Sragen, Klaten; Tourism Ambassador community, and business people.

This research uses literature study data sources, document analysis and direct observation. The literature study is taken from references related to the theory and the findings needed; the documents used are various forms of regulation, mass media news and minutes related to soloraya tourism forums; and direct observation, the researchers participated in directly observing the meeting process of the Soloraya Tourism Forum.

The pattern of analysis in this study is (1) explaining stakeholder perceptions of the existence of the forum (2) explaining the structure, functions and management of the forum (3) drawing conclusions.

4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The Soloraya Tourism Forum starts from 2017 at the Central Java Tourism Promotion Technical Guidance event (Murdaningsih, 2017. republika.co.id). Officially agreed through a Memorandum of Understanding or MoA on 3 May 2018 at the Tourism Information Center (TIC) Building of the Tourism Mandala in Klaten Regency (Kominfo Klaten, 2018. <http://klatenkab.go.id>).

The forum members' perceptions obtained from the survey results found that they realized that to advance tourism at this time cannot be done separately, but there is no territorial boundary, where each region has its own potential that can complement each other so that the existence of the

Soloraya Tourism Forum becomes priority. (informant interview 1, 11 January 2019).

This finding can be used as evidence that at the level of ideas a similar agreement and perception has emerged about the importance of establishing the Soloraya tourism forum as a forum for cooperation to develop tourism together.

When digging deeper into the structure, the Soloraya tourism forum has a simple structure with the head of the Soloraya Tourism Office. The existing structure is very simple and only consists of official parties (does not involve stakeholders from other agencies).

As for the function of the part of the structure, it has not fully gone as expected. This is caused by several problems, among others: First, there are weaknesses in coordination, they seem to walk on their own starting from: a) an agreement to raise the branding of "The Spirit of Java" which has not been optimal because the survey results revealed that up to now each region has struggled tourist attraction in the area becomes a destination for the area of Soloraya; b) There are no "tour packages" that will later become joint tourism promotion content; c) there is no planning for making integrated digital tourism applications for soloraya; d) the absence of tourism transportation modes that connect between regions in Soloraya such as the Werkudara Tourist Bus which has not been able to operate beyond the Solo City boundary (Suwarmin, 2018. <http://news.solopos.com>).

The information above can be a knowledge that at the level of actual ideas between stakeholders (governments of Subosukowonosraten) have initiated the forum to bargaining, and equated the vision of the forum. However, the institutional formation structure is still very weak where they do not involve other stakeholders in the forum structure. When other stakeholders are not involved in the structure, then their ideas (forum members) become more limited and less developed. Moreover, the survey results directly on the forum show that forum meetings are more widely used to submit formal reports.

This is one of the difficulties, besides the lack of strong cross-sectoral policy structures that support each other, there is also a very important thing, namely the weakness of internal coordination. This was acknowledged by members of the daily forum because it was still difficult to arrange time to meet. As for the meetings that have been determined there are still many rejections from members because on the specified day they are preoccupied with their

respective business affairs (informant interview 1, 11 January 2019).

A bottomless gap is the regional autonomy policy which has been responded to by a variety of local governments. Autonomy is used as a momentum to develop its own region, and tends to compete with other regions, especially adjacent areas (Wahyudi, 2010). This problem also received support from the reality that is the main focus of regional autonomy at this time in the district / city. And there is no explicit regulation of territorial management between regencies or cities (Wahyudi, 2010). Furthermore, the results of the analysis show that there is still a sectoral ego that cannot be avoided.

Each region is still seen favoring its tourism policy as Boyolali said that it had collaborated with PT. Oroundo Mobile Asia makes a tourism map application, this tourism application contains 25 special interest points for Boyolali tourism which are broadcast throughout the world, it offers other areas in Soloraya to also make but not through the Soloraya tourism forum but for their respective regions.

The issue of sectoral ego is getting stronger also because there is no support for rules that clearly provide a place for regional development planning forums that are in more than one district or city in one province and influence the priority of forum budgets from each city or district (Wahyudi, 2010, Kambo, 2015).

The next finding is the absence of integrated planning between stakeholders. The results of the study found that there were several stakeholders who had a major influence on the formation and institutional development of the Soloraya tourism forum. Forums outside the Soloraya tourism forum that have the same goal of developing tourism institutions have not been fully involved in the activities facilitated by the forum. The existence of other forums has their own planning (document analysis and participant observation).

From the explanation above, we can understand that the existence of a tourism forum cannot enter the level of action as expected in the intergovernmental network model. There are still many difficulties that are experienced so as to enter the level of network development and strengthening, forum management including conflict management, and the construction of forum facilities. The existence of a tourism forum cannot strengthen the network, if this condition is left then the Soloraya tourism forum will only sharpen the contestation of interests, where information on the differences in

each region makes jealousy of other regions that have not been able to do these successes and this has been happen.

We provide suggestions, for further research dissecting the form of forums into detailed descriptions in each of its networks. So that the formula can be found, which is a stage that must be done by the government to form an intergovernmental network-based cooperation forum that is more effective and in accordance with the characteristics of stakeholders.

5. CONCLUSION

The establishment of the Soloraya tourism forum still sharpens competition in interests. Some unresolved issues and obstacles to the formation of an intergovernmental network-based tourism forum are the first paradox between the development of the regionalization (theoretical) approach and the strengthening of the implementation of regional autonomy (practical) and secondly, the absence of clear rules for development planning forums territory more than one district / city. This issue is given to forum management, namely weak coordination, sectoral ego and lack of integration of planning among stakeholders.

This research suggests that further research explores the portrait of the forum network as a whole in order to find the best alternative in the formation of an intergovernmental network-based tourism forum.

REFERENCES

- Agranoff, R. (2003). *A New look at the Value-Adding Functions of Intergovernmental Network. Paper Presented for Seventh National Public Management Research Conference*. Georgetown University.
- Asero I, I., Simona, G., and Venera, T. (2015). Building Tourism Networks through Tourist Mobility. *Journal of Travel Research*. 1(1): 1–13.
- Briedenhann, J & Eugenia, W. (2004). Tourism Routes as A Tool For The Economic Development of Rural Areas: Vibrant Hope or Impossible Dream?. *Tourism Management*. 2(5): 71-79.
- Chi-Ok Oh. (2005). The Contribution Of Tourism Development To Economic Growth In The Korean Economy. *Tourism Management*. 26: 39-44.
- Fisk, J., Good, A. J., and Nelson, S. (2019). Collaboration After Disaster: Explaining Intergovernmental Collaboration During the EPA Gold King Mine and TVA Coal Ash Recoveries. *Risk, Hazards & Crisis in Public Policy*. 10(1): 52-73.
- Guccio, C et al. (2018). A Round Trip on Decentralization in the tourism sector. *Annals of tourism research*. 72(1), Pp. 140-155
- Kambo, G.A. (2015). Etnisitas dalam Otonomi Daerah. *Jurnal Magister Ilmu Politik Universitas Hasanuddin*. 1(1), pp. 1-8.
- Kominfo Klaten. (2018). Penandatanganan Moa Upaya Perkuat Pariwisata Di Solo Raya. <http://klatenkab.go.id/>, Diakses 5 Januari 2019, pukul 05: 26.
- Law No.10 of 2009
- Martinez, R. M. (2010). Use of Intergovernmental Networks for Establishing a Collaborative Environment in Tribal Transportation Initiatives Best Practices. *Transportation Research Record: Journal of the Transportation Research Board* 2174. 1(1): 77–83.
- Mosadegh, M.J and Behboudi, M. 2011. Using Social Network Paradigm for Developing a Conceptual Framework in CRM. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*. 1(4): 63-71.
- Mullen, C.A., and Kochan, F.K. (2000). Creating a Collaborative Leadership Network: An Organic View Of Change. *International Journal of Leadership in Education*. 3(3): 183-200
- Murdaningsih, D. (2017). Forum Solo Raya akan Kembangkan Pariwisata di Solo. republika.co.id. Di akses 5 Januari 2019, pukul 04:28.
- O'toole, L.J and Meier, K. (2004). *Public Management in Intergovernmental Network: Matching Structural Networks and Managerial Networking*. JPART. 14(1), pp. 469-494.
- PLOD and APEKSI, Final Report on the Model of Cooperation between Regions
- Prafitri, G.A and Damayanti, M. 2016. Kapasitas Kelembagaan dalam Pengembangan Desa Wisata (Studi Kasus: Desa Wisata Ketenger, Banyumas). *Jurnal Pengembangan Kota*. 4(1): 76–86.
- Putranto, A.E. (2013). Peran BKAD Subosukawonosraten dalam Kerjasama antar Daerah. *Jurnal Pembangunan Wilayah dan Kota*. 9(2): 111-121.
- Scheyvens, Regina.(1999). Ecotourism and the empowerment of local communities. *Tourism Management*. 20: 245-249.
- Sugiyono. (2009). *Metode Penelitian Kuantitatif Kualitatif dan R&D*. Alfabeta: Bandung
- Tang, P., Chen, H, and Shao, S. (2018). Examining the Intergovernmental and Interorganizational Network of Responding to Major Accidents for Improving the Emergency Management System in China. *Complexity*. 1(1): 1-17.
- Wahyudi. (2010). *Kajian Kerjasama Daerah dalam Pengelolaan dan Pengembangan Kawasan Wisata Dataran Tinggi Dieng*. Tesis Universitas Diponegoro : Semarang.
- Wang, L and Youtsumoto, Y. (2019). Conflict in tourism development in rural China. *Tourism Management*. 70(1), Pp. 188-200.
- Warsono, H. (2009). Networking dalam Intergovernmental Management. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Kebijakan Publik*. 6(1): 79-91.
- Suwarmin. 2018. Soloraya Destinasi Wisata Favorit. <http://news.solopos.com>. diakses 5 Januari 2019, pukul 06:30