

# Cultural Village Management Model to Enhance Cultural Tourism in the Special Region of Yogyakarta

Anggarani Pribudi<sup>1</sup>, Vina Dini Pravita<sup>2</sup>, Supardal<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2</sup>Sekolah Tinggi Pariwisata Ambarrukmo (STIPRAM) Yogyakarta, <sup>3</sup>Magister Ilmu Pemerintahan, Sekolah Tinggi Pembangunan Masyarakat Desa 'APMD' Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Email: anggaranipribudi@stipram.ac.id, vinadinipravita@stipram.ac.id, gusdal66@gmail.com

## Keywords

Cultural Village, Management, Cultural Tourism Development

## ABSTRACT

*One of the main elements in the Yogyakarta privilege/specialty policy is cultural development, including strengthening cultural villages as an integral part that supports Yogyakarta as a special region. In connection with the development of cultural villages, there is an opportunity to develop cultural tourism based on cultural villages that can be offered to both domestic and foreign tourists. In fact, there are still several problems with developing cultural villages. One of the problems is structural issues which are still dominant, considering that the cultural village was formed by the provincial government with various regulatory policies, and as a result, cultural villages are not given independence to manage themselves but rather are driven by the supra-village. Village dependency is also caused by the village's inadequacy to develop cultural tourism village so it needs guidance from the government and is far from being self-sufficient. This study uses an exploratory qualitative approach, by analyzing each model of a cultural village and its potential for developing cultural village-based cultural tourism. Data collection was carried out by in-depth interviews with government officials in charge of the cultural department and cultural stakeholders in the cultural villages. The results of the study show that the formation of several cultural village models has not resulted in cultural village-based cultural tourism. This is because cultural villages are more preoccupied with serving various policies from the cultural service and budget accountability given to cultural villages. Thus, cultural villages run out of energy to innovate in cultural events that can be offered to tourists. Furthermore, the limited human resources to manage cultural tourism in each village are also an important problem that still hinders the development of cultural tourism villages.*

## INTRODUCTION

Yogyakarta's privilege law affects village governance, where the village can be given the status of a cultural village according to its development (Triputro & Pribudi, 2022). The cultural village is a model village in the Special Region of Yogyakarta which has special characteristics according to the privilege value of the Special Region of Yogyakarta (Supardal, Triputro, & Nugroho, 2022). There are three models of cultural villages in Yogyakarta: cultural pilot villages, cultural villages, and cultural independent villages with distinct

characteristics. The purpose of establishing a cultural village is to preserve the culture in Yogyakarta in order to create quality cultural tourism and improve the welfare of the villagers.

The management of a cultural village cannot be separated from the planning that has been determined by the Yogyakarta Special Region Government, particularly by the Cultural Office (Kundha Kabudayan) as the regional apparatus carrying out cultural affairs as well as privilege affairs in the field of culture. At the provincial government level, planning for cultural affairs is certainly inseparable from the Regional Medium Term Development Plan (RPJMD) as stipulated by the Regional Regulation of the Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 3 of 2018 concerning the 2017-2022 Medium Term Development Plan (Regulation of The Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 6 of 2013 Concerning Regional Medium Term Development Plan 2012 - 2017, 2013). In the context of Privileges affairs in the field of culture are related to various policies starting from Law Number 13 of 2012 concerning Privileges of the Special Region of Yogyakarta and various implementing regulations (Law of The Republic of Indonesia Number 13 of 2012 Concerning The Privilege of The Special Region of Yogyakarta, 2012).

Technically and operationally, the various policies governing cultural affairs are carried out by the Cultural Office by establishing strategic plans, work plans, budget plans, and various other technical policies. The cultural village management plan is determined by the Cultural Office with reference to other supporting policies. One of the policy references used is the 2005-2025 Regional Long-Term Development Plan, where the 2nd mission is "Creating a noble culture that is supported by concepts, cultural knowledge, preservation and development of cultural products, and cultural values on an ongoing basis"(Regulation of The Province of Yogyakarta Special Region Number 2 of 2009 Concerning The Long Term Development Plan, 2005–2025, 2009). One of its priorities is the implementation of a healthy and respectable cultural development process at all levels of society which is supported by the Keraton Ngayogyakarta Hadiningrat and other cultural development centers. The momentum to realize a noble culture that is accompanied by cultural values in a sustainable manner is getting stronger after the enactment of Law Number 13 of 2012 concerning the Privilege of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, where one of the privilege affairs is cultural affairs. The privilege affairs are accompanied by the distribution of the State Budget in the form of Privileges Funds allocated to five privilege affairs. Based on the results of the 2013-2017 RPJMD study, the allocation of the privileged budget for cultural affairs is as follows:

Table. 1 Privilege Fund Allocation for Cultural Affairs 2013-2017

Year	Privilege Fund (IDR)	Cultural Affairs (IDR)	Percentage (%)
2013	231.392.653.500,-	212.546.511.000,-	91,86
2014	523.874.719.000,-	375.178.719.000,-	71,62
2015	547.450.000.000,-	420.800.000.000,-	76,87
2016	547.450.000.000,-	179.050.365.000,-	32,71
2017	800.000.000.000,-	439.901.748.000,-	54,99

Source: (Regulation of The Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 6 of 2013 Concerning Regional Medium Term Development Plan 2012 - 2017, 2013)

As can be seen from the table above, the highest allocation for the implementation of cultural affairs programs has reached 91.86 percent. Even though in 2016-2017 the percentage has decreased, in terms of nominal value it is still quite large. This shows that cultural affairs have the widest and most massive scale in the entire Yogyakarta region with the most volume of programs and activities. In this case, the privilege fund for cultural affairs generally occupies the largest portion compared to the other four privilege affairs, which is the starting point for the development of a cultural tourism village. The policy directions are as follows: (1) Developing multi-stakeholder awareness of the development of material and intangible culture; (2) Increasing the quantity and quality of services and management of cultural facilities; and (3) Strengthening cultural preservation institutions, and developing culture in Cultural Conservation Areas, Cultural Saujanas, Villages, and Cultural Villages. The implementation of special affairs in the field of culture aims to maintain and develop the tangible and intangible culture that already exists in the cultural village which is then materialized in the allocation of the privilege fund for 2018 – 2022 as a continuation of the previous five-year period.

Table 2. Privilege Fund Allocation for Cultural Affairs 2018-2022

Year	Privilege Fund (IDR)	Cultural Affairs (IDR)	Percentage (%)
2018	1.000.000.000.000,-	406.633.000.000,-	40,66
2019	1.200.000.000.000,-	554.102.132.984,-	46,18
2020	1.320.000.000.000,-	744.003.521.915,-	56,36
2021	1.320.000.000.000,-	755.597.150.733,-	57,24
2022	1.320.000.000.000,-	914.570.761.347,-	69,29

Source: (Paniradya Kaistimewan, 2022)

The data above shows that the privilege fund from the state budget continues to increase from the previous period, as well as allocations that have increased every year from 40.66% in 2018 to 69.29% in 2022 (provisional projection). The allocation budget for cultural affairs, including the management of cultural villages, has the largest amount compared to the other four privilege affairs. This large amount of budget has significant potential for cultural village management. The problem is whether Yogyakarta's cultural village management model is effective for both developing and sustaining cultural tourism that can attract domestic and international tourists. The scope of the development of a cultural village as stated by Mappi encompasses:

"Several aspects included in cultural tourism objects include birth ceremonies, traditional dances, traditional music, weddings, traditional clothing (customary clothing), various kinds of ceremonies (traditional agriculture and harvest ceremonies), historical buildings, cultural heritage, traditional relics, traditional fabrics (such as woven cloth), cultural festivals and traditional performances, local textile products, historical and cultural museums, and other local customs" (Asriandy, 2016)

As mentioned above, the potential for developing cultural tourism in cultural villages in the Special Region of Yogyakarta is quite broad because each village has unique cultural values and has the potential to be developed into a tourist attraction. This study will explore to what extent these cultural village models are capable to develop quality cultural tourism in the Special Region of Yogyakarta.

## **METHODS**

This study uses exploratory qualitative methods. Primary data was collected by conducting interviews and Focus Group Discussions with cultural village stakeholders, village assistants, and The Cultural Office (Kundha Kabudayan) Special Region of Yogyakarta officials who evaluated the implementation of cultural villages. Secondary data is obtained by analyzing policy documents related to cultural villages and their models and their impact on the development of cultural tourism in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. Data analysis was carried out using content analysis which focused on an in-depth discussion of the contents of the information. The analysis process was carried out by identifying data, content analysis, codification, and interpretation to answer research questions.

## **RESULTS**

### **Cultural Development Model in The Special Region of Yogyakarta**

#### **1. Cultural Pilot Village Model**

Before being designated as a Cultural Village, the village first started at the Cultural Village Pilot level. To prepare a village to become a cultural village, the Yogyakarta Special Region Cultural Office had developed a Cultural Village Pilot program. The designated pilot villages were facilitated with coaching by a team of cultural village facilitators, equipment assistance, and a potential showcase. A number of cultural village pilots in each district/city were then recommended by the Regency/City Cultural Office to be assessed for their feasibility and proposed as cultural villages. The recommendations from the districts were then assessed by an assessment team formed by the Yogyakarta Special Region Cultural Office.

Regulations regarding the role and authority of the Regency/City Regional Government in the cultural village pilot program had not yet been regulated in Governor Regulation Number 36 of 2014, instead, the regulations only regulated villages that were proposed to become Cultural villages are villages with the status of Cultural Village Pilots. The authority of the Regency/City Government was implicitly regulated in Special Regional Regulation Number 3 of 2017, where the authority to preserve and develop culture lies with the Regional Government of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, including establishing policies; planning, organizing, monitoring and evaluating, up to the establishment of mechanisms for the maintenance and development of culture (Regulation of The Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 3 of 2017 Concerning The Preservation and Development of Culture, 2017). Articles 27 and 28 stipulated that in carrying out the authority to cultural preservation, the Government of the Special Region of Yogyakarta could involve Regency/Municipal Governments. As for the implementation of the duties and authority of cultural preservation and development in accordance with the provisions of laws and regulations.

The involvement of the Regency/City Regional Government had begun to appear explicitly in the 2017 – 2022 Strategic Plan for the Special Region of Yogyakarta Cultural Office for the implementation of the privileges of the Special Region of Yogyakarta for cultural affairs in customary activities, arts, traditions, and cultural institutions, had targeted a number of villages that have developed into a Cultural Village Pilot, from its previous status as a Cultural pocket). These activities were the responsibility of the Regency/City Government through the Regency/City Culture Office (Kundho Kabudayan). The target achievements were 59 villages consisting of 2 in Yogyakarta City, 5 in Bantul Regency, 16 in Kulon Progo Regency, 32 in Sleman Regency, and 14 pilot cultural villages in Gunungkidul Regency. In the case of setting up cultural village pilots, there was no clear provision found in the governor's regulation which stated that "regulations regarding

cultural village pilots are further regulated by a district head/mayor regulation". This is sufficient to become a juridical basis for the Regency/City in establishing a policy to assist the Government of the Special Region of Yogyakarta in the context of preparing the pilot for a cultural village. Related to the task of preparing the Cultural Village, the Regency/City Government stipulated a policy in the form of a Regent's Regulation on Cultural Village Initiatives and a Regent's Decree concerning the Establishment of Cultural Village Initiatives.

One of the regencies that had established a policy regarding Cultural Village Pilots is Bantul Regent Regulation Number 136 of 2020 concerning Cultural Village Initiatives. In the preamble, it was stated that "in the context of helping the implementation of cultural affairs, this can be done through the establishment of a Cultural Village Pilot". The Cultural Village pilot was a village that was prepared to be a Cultural Village (Bantul Regent Regulation Number 136 of 2020 Concerning Cultural Village Pilot, 2020). The arrangement regarding the Cultural Village Initiative was, in fact, similar to Governor Regulation Number 36 of 2014 concerning the Establishment of a Cultural Village, the difference lay in the focus of regulation in the Regency scope. There are similarities in several respects including the procedures for establishing Cultural Village Pilots and Evaluation Teams, managing and forming Managers, fostering Cultural Village Pilots, funding, parameters for assessing Cultural villages, and determining the weight of the assessment. In accordance with the assessment criteria, if a village obtained a total score of 0-259 points, then the village was classified as a Cultural Village Pilot. Then, if the village scored more than 260 points, the pilot village could be proposed to become a cultural village.

According to (Mumford, 2016). and (Williams, 1975) who wrote about the relationship between city and culture, it could be said that the erosion of the values and spirit of excellence which is depicted in the spirit of Yogya Istimewa (Yogyakarta's privilege) had taken place in Yogyakarta as the part of the cultural change process. The increasingly heterogeneous population of Yogyakarta and the strong influence of globalization had diminished the understanding of local cultural concepts that potentially erode the spirit of Yogyakarta's specialness. There was an urgency to redefine these cultural concepts, as Hamengku Buwono IX (The former Sultan) had done by encapsulating the concept of 'the throne for the people' when he reigned as the Sultan of Yogyakarta (Damayanti, 2005). If there was no effort to reinterpret the cultural concepts, then Yogyakarta's privilege/specialty will only be valuable as a historical relic. At the conceptual level, efforts to preserve and inherit the noble culture were entirely in the hand of the local community of Yogyakarta, which was also embodied in the spatial components of the city of Yogyakarta. In some discussions, reinterpreting the concept of culture to fit its era required creativity to adjust to positive things and courage to reject negative things.

Cultural tourism management was an important aspect to attract tourists to visit cultural tourism destinations. This was reinforced by a quote put forward by Tunggal Prasodjo regarding tourism management as follows:

"The attractiveness of tourist destinations cannot be separated from several factors including the tourist destination, the management organization, and the tourists. To increase tourist visits, the ability of tourist destination management both from development and services will determine the interest of tourists to come" (Mumford, 2016)

In this cultural pilot stage, the institutional aspect of tourism became the important aspect before the development of tourism destination was carried out (Luo, Moyle, Bao, & Zhong, 2016). There were many cases of tourism destination development that did not have clear institutions which caused the management to fail and even led to horizontal conflicts. In fact, the institutional capacity of the cultural pilot villages was still inadequate because most of the villages were highly dependent on the regency government. On the other hand, the regency government couldn't guide the cultural pilot villages optimally due to a lack of adequate resources in terms of tourism governance, while the number of assisted villages remains large.

## **2. Cultural Village Model**

Based on the Yogyakarta Special Region Regulation Number 1 of 2013 on the Authority in the Privileges of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, as amended by the Yogyakarta Special Region Regulation Number 1 of 2015 (Dirgahayani, 2013). Article 4 stated that the provincial government has the authority in cultural affairs. The authority in cultural affairs was organized for the preservation and development of the results of creation, taste, creativity, and work in the form of values, knowledge, norms, customs, objects, art, and noble traditions that were rooted in Yogyakarta society (Regulation of The Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 1 of 2015 Regarding Amendment to Regulation of The Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 1 of 2013 Concerning Authority In Yogyakarta's Privilege Affairs, 2015). The implementation of the authority in the field of culture was carried out through the policy for the protection, development, and use of culture. Other provisions regarding the regulation of authority in cultural matters are regulated by separate regional regulations.

The regulation of the authority of cultural affairs was stipulated by Yogyakarta Special Region Regulation Number 3 of 2017 concerning The Preservation and Development of Culture, with the scope of regulation including (a) cultural objects; (b) planning; (c) preservation; (d) development; (e) management; (f) duties of

authority; (g) awards; (h) roles and responsibilities of the Sultanate and Duchy; and (i) roles and responsibilities of the community. The objectives of regulating the maintenance and development of culture were (a) strengthening the character and identity of the community; (b) realizing the maintenance of the cultural values of the Special Region of Yogyakarta in the lives of the community, institutions, and government; (c) developing the culture of the Special Region of Yogyakarta to increase cultural resilience and the contribution of DIY culture in the midst of world civilization; (d) realizing equal access to cultural activities and increasing appreciation of art and creativity of cultural works; and (e) improving the welfare of the community (Regulation of The Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 3 of 2017 Concerning The Preservation and Development of Culture, 2017)

The authority of the Special Region of Yogyakarta in cultural affairs could be assigned to the Regency/City Government and to the Village Government (Dirgahayani, 2013). In accordance with Article 29, the village government was authorized to carry out the preservation and development of culture in its area. The duties included (a) implementing the Maintenance and Development of Cultural Objects at the village level; and (b) encouraging, growing, fostering, and increasing public awareness of rights, obligations, and participation in the Maintenance and Development of Culture. In addition, the duties of the Village Government also assist the District Government in the stages of inventorying cultural objects in the village and organizing the management of Cultural Villages and cultural heritage areas.

Yogyakarta Special Region Regulation Number 3 of 2017 is relevant to Governor Regulation Number 13 of 2022 on the Assignment of Privileged Affairs (replacement for Governor Regulation Number 131 of 2018 on the Assignment of Privileged Affairs (Alqarni et al., 2022)). Article 8 stated that the special affairs that could be assigned to the Village Government included: (a) formulation and stipulation of policy regulations and technical guidelines for the maintenance and development of cultural objects at the village level; (b) planning, implementation, control, and development of cultural objects at the *kalurahan* level; (c) increasing the role of village communities in the maintenance and development of culture; (d) collecting data on village cultural potential; (e) organizing and managing cultural villages and/or cultural areas; and (f) providing facilities and infrastructure to support cultural affairs programs/activities (Regulation of The Governor of Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 13 of 2022 Concerning Assignment of Privilege Affairs, 2022).

At this stage of the cultural village, the village had great potential to develop its culture as a cultural tourism commodity. Because juridically, villages were given broad authority to create various local cultural events, to attract domestic and international tourists. However, in practice, villages had not been able to optimize the management of local culture-based tourism, due to several limitations, especially budget limitations where villages were still very dependent on provincial government assistance. As a result, cultural villages were preoccupied with administrative issues of accountability for the use of the budget, which is time-consuming. In addition, limited human resources had also led to a lack of innovation in the development of cultural activities. The budget system was also based on proposals submitted and approved by the Culture Office. This was different from the cultural independent village model, which had a fixed allocation of 1 billion rupiah for the development of cultural activities. The implementation of cultural villages was based on Governor Regulation No. 36/2014 on Cultural Villages, as the basis for managing cultural villages to support cultural tourism in the village (Regulation of The Governor of The Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 36 of 2014 Concerning Cultural Villages, 2014)

In this cultural village model, the potential to develop cultural-based tourism was extensive, because in this model the village had conducted many cultural performance events. The performance of these cultural events had attracted a number of domestic and foreign tourists. The ability of cultural villages to package a variety of cultural events and bring in tourists will determine the success of cultural-based tourism development. Overall, not every cultural village had made cultural performances to be their main attraction to attract tourists because cultural villages focused more on assignments from the Cultural Office, especially in administrative matters (Anderson, 2015). Even the existence of a cultural village assistant team had not been optimal in generating the spirit and cultural events in cultural villages, due to shifting focus where facilitators were also assigned with different tasks from the Cultural Office.

McKercher and Du Cros in (Ardika, 2007) argued that the development of cultural tourism was closely related to the appreciation of the community to continuously maintained and preserved their cultural assets or cultural heritage which in its development is currently diminishing. The expert then elaborated that basically, cultural tourism had at least four elements, such as tourism, cultural assets management, consumption of products/works, and cultural tourists themselves (Ibrahim, Hafel, & Lamasi, 2018). In the context of a cultural village, the fact was that the four elements mentioned above had not been fully developed. The tourism potential in cultural villages had yet to be explored in depth and developed as a cultural tourism attraction. In terms of the use of cultural assets in cultural villages, it had not been carried out effectively either. For example, the use of cultural assets in the form of gamelan instruments, which were still seen as a requirement for a cultural village, and had not yet been developed as an attractive tourist activity, such as learning gamelan for

tourists. Artifacts and culinary products that have traditional values had also not been maximized due to a lack of both human and capital resources. The three aforementioned elements that had not been implemented in a conducive and maximal way also caused the small number of tourists (domestic and foreign) visiting the cultural village.

### **3. Cultural Independent Village Model**

Along with the growth of the Cultural Village and the good intentions of the Yogyakarta Special Region Government to immediately address the problem of poverty and the dynamics of village development, it was deemed necessary to involve and synergize many stakeholders from cross-sectoral programs and activities. According to the results of a 2018 study by the Yogyakarta Special Region Cultural Service submitted by Arif Sulfiyanto via *Kedaulatan Rakyat* newspaper (Sulfiyanto, 2020), first, the Cultural Independent Village is an autonomous village that is able to meet its own needs through the utilization and beneficitation of all village internal and external resources (supra-village) to actualize, develop, and conserve its cultural potential wealth (objects and/or intangibles) through involving the active participation of citizens in carrying out community development and empowerment.

Second, the formation of the Cultural Independent Village was motivated by the implementation of regional autonomy since 2001 which had not turned out as expected. Sectoral ego still existed, making economic, social, and cultural development unhealthy, unfair, and inefficient from the regional perspective. A study from the drafting team for the Independent Culture Village Grand Design for the Special Region of Yogyakarta in 2020 stated that the impact of sectoral ego was ineffective budget allocation. Third, the absorption of poverty alleviation funds does not reach the community and is used more by the bureaucracy. The development process and village assistance did not experience good cohesion between Regional Government Organizations and villages as subjects and objects of development. This is due to the fact that the Regional Government Organizations had not yet had a clear framework for promoting comprehensive and measurable village development. Village ideals are still seen from the different perspectives of each Regional Government Organization, so there is no ideal form or close to the plenary of village development that one wants to refer to. This sectoral issue ultimately stuck in the program and performance appraisal. For this reason, in the context of implementing culturally independent villages, it is necessary to harmonize the implementation of village development policies with economic development, culture, tourism, food, gender mainstreaming, entrepreneurship, mental health, technology, and poverty alleviation.

Fourth, efforts to develop culturally independent villages were based on the principle that "Cultural Independent Villages as Development Goals in the Special Region of Yogyakarta". In this case, there was an initiation from the regional government of the Special Region of Yogyakarta to initiate a pilot project for village development across Regional Apparatus Organizations including, Cultural Village (Cultural Office), Tourism Village (Tourism Office), Prima Village (Women's Empowerment, Child Protection, and Population Control Office), Preneur Village (Cooperative & SMEs Office). Fifth, the biggest challenge in implementing Cultural Independent Village lay in reversing the top-down development paradigm to a bottom-up one. The objectives of the establishment of Cultural Independent Village were as follows: (1) realizing village self-reliance in improving the welfare of its community through cultural development, tourism, inclusive participation of women, entrepreneurship, and food security, (2) strengthening village potential as a bastion of cultural preservation in the face of globalization and strengthen the village institutional system to reduce poverty through food security, entrepreneurship, and tourism, (3) strengthening the village information system as a space for socialization, promotion, and marketing, (4) reinforcing the capacity of the village community and institutions in terms of intellectual and skills needed for village management, (5) strengthening the value system and community life for security and peace.

The government's target set forth in the 2017-2022 Regional Medium-Term Development Plan is to actualize 20 Cultural Independent Villages in 2022. In 2020 the Yogyakarta Special Region Government achieved half of the target by conducting training and mentoring in 10 Cultural Independent Villages. The provincial government needed intensive efforts to create a whole culturally independent village because only a few villages had fulfilled the four categories of Cultural Independent Villages (Tourism, Culture, Preneur, and Prima village). The following were several villages that had fulfilled the requirements as independent cultural villages, including Putat Village, Kapanewon Patuk and Bejiharjo Village, Kapanewon Karangmojo, and Gunung Kidul Regency. For this reason, training and institutional facilitation must always be carried out in a comprehensive manner. Through the Cultural Independent Village Institution, it is expected that villages could become economic granaries (economic aspects), cultural centers (local cultural preservation), and village entrepreneurship networks (community independence). The Governor of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono X in 2021 stated that preservation efforts, including protection, development and utilization of cultural wealth and diversity within the village, were intended to strengthen Yogyakarta's identity as an integral part of national culture. Special regional regulation Number 3 of 2017 also stated that cultural development is characterized by inclusiveness, where the community becomes the subject of cultural

development (Regulation of The Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 3 of 2017 Concerning the Preservation and Development of Culture, 2017).

A Cultural Independent Village is a village that is sovereign, has integrity, and is innovative in living and actualizing its special values, through the utilization of its resources and culture by involving the active participation of its citizens. Society becomes a subject in the development of special values through the utilization of the wealth of resources and culture with active participation. The economic growth of rural communities is in the hands of the people themselves. This awareness to grow the economy through an independent, cultured, and efficient village must be fostered by the village community. The village had the potential to be self-managed, and the community could shop for original products from the village. This method is one of the efforts where economic independence can be actualized. Sri Sultan also emphasized the importance of young people’s ability to create jobs in the village to reduce urbanization. Building their own village would certainly be able to improve the quality of employment by developing creativity and entrepreneurship (Public Relations of Government of The Special Region of Yogyakarta, 2021)

Based on the 2017-2022 program and activity plans, program planning and activities related to Cultural Village Management are determined with the following funding details:

Table. 3 Recapitulation of Cultural Village Programs, Activities and Funding.

No	Programs and Activities	Funding Allocation (IDR)					Regional Organization
		8	9	10	11	12	
	Coaching & Development Cultural Independent Village	-	1.184.200.000,-	5.500.000.000,-	8.000.000.000,-	8.000.000.000,-	Cooperative Service SMEs, Tourism Office, Women & Community Empowerment Agency
	Guidance & Development of Cultural Villages	10.000.000.000,-	15.000.000.000,-	15.000.000.000,-	16.500.000.000,-	23.000.000.000,-	Cultural Office (Province)
	Fostering and Development of Cultural Village Pilots & Cultural Enclaves	10.900.000.000,-	15.150.000.000,-	15.150.000.000,-	15.150.000.000,-	18.150.000.000,-	Cultural Office (City/Regency)
	Village Entrepreneurship Development	-	500.000.000,-	2.500.000.000	5.000.000.000,-	5.000.000.000,-	Women & Community Empowerment Agency
	Total	20.900.000.000,-	31.834.000.000,-	38.150.000.000,-	44.650.000.000,-	54.150.000.000,-	Cultural Office (City/Regency)

Source: Data processed from the 2017-2022 Yogyakarta Special Region Culture Office strategy plan

The data above showed that Cultural Village programs, activities and funding had increased from year to year, which also had an impact on increasing the quantity and intensity of cultural village activities. In fact, Cultural Village programs and activities were not limited to the four aspects above, but there were groups of programs and activities that involved the Cultural Village, such as cultural exhibitions, fostering customary institutions and traditions, etc. These activities were not organized solely for the Cultural Village but also involved various groups/communities outside the Cultural Village context(Phondani, Maikhuri, & Bisht, 2013). The results of identification related to cultural/independent village assistance by the appointed Regional Apparatus Organizations had not been maximized(Supardal et al., 2022). In practice, intensive mentoring was carried out by cultural/independent village assistants/facilitators recruited by the Cultural Office who acted as a facilitator, as well as a mediator between the Cultural Office and the villages, even as an extension of the service. In carrying out the assistance, the assistants always acted and spoke in the style of the Cultural Office bureaucrat. As a result, the cultural village did not have room for further discussion, because all activity procedures had been determined by the Cultural Office. In this case, the village was positioned as the executor of the activities and the assistant only acted as a facilitator in preparation for cultural activities hosted by the

villages. Judging from the substance of the existence of cultural and culturally independent villages, villages had not shown optimal performance, especially in terms of empowering citizens and increasing economic productivity. Even in some cases, cultural villages have to contribute financially to the success of the cultural events being held, which was inversely proportional to the goals of cultural villages which were supposed to help improve the economy of the village's community. In the future it would be necessary to recommend that the role of the assistant not only serve the Cultural Office but also serve and facilitate village/sub-district residents, particularly to explore the cultural potential of each culture which could be promoted on a wider scale. Thus, the facilitators must actively work with the community and not just be a spokesperson for the Cultural Office as had been the case so far. This means that there must be a facilitator's alignment with the community he/she assists, even though the facilitator's recruitment and salary were Cultural Office's responsibility.

The results of the study showed that village autonomy in the context of a Cultural Independent Village had not been implemented properly. This meant that a Cultural Independent Village had not met the requirements for an autonomous village. This could be seen from the implementation of the principles of a Cultural Independent Village, namely: sovereignty, mahardika/independence, integrity, and innovation had not been performed successfully. The implementation of the four pillars of independent villages, namely cultural villages, tourism villages, preneur villages, and prima (women empowerment) villages, were not fully autonomous, because the roles of Regional Apparatus Organizations and cultural village assistants were still dominant, both in budget management and program management. Consequently, a Cultural Independent Village did not have full autonomy in managing the village for the welfare of the community, because every program had been set up by the respective Regional Apparatus Organizations, especially the Cultural Office of the Special Region of Yogyakarta.

In discussing the implementation of a Cultural Independent Village as a form of village autonomy, it could be viewed from a normative and practical approach. An independent village according to normative juridical must have certain principles in carrying out village services and development. These principles were independence, sovereignty, integrity, and innovation in managing village governance. According to Governor Regulation No. 93 of 2020 concerning Cultural Independent Villages/Kelurahan, Cultural Independent Villages were independent, sovereign, integrity, and innovative villages/sub-districts in living and actualizing privilege values through the utilization of its rich resources and culture by involving the active participation of the community to carry out development and community empowerment to realize the preservation of environment, welfare, and peace in unity in diversity (Regulation of The Governor of The Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 93 of 2020 Concerning Cultural Independent Village, 2020).

In accordance with Article 3 of Governor Regulation No. 93 of 2020 concerning Cultural Independent Villages/Kelurahan the implementation of the cultural independent village policy must carry out 4 areas, as follow: cultural villages, tourism villages, pre-employment villages, and prima villages/women's empowerment. Thus, the success of a Cultural Independent Village was determined by the good synergy of these four aspects. This was also in line with Article 5 paragraph (1) namely the Cultural Independent Village was formed from a Cultural Village which includes tourism activities, empowering small and medium enterprises, and empowering women. The problem was in the implementation of the independent village policy implemented by four regional apparatus organizations had not optimally worked in improving the community's welfare autonomously.

A completely Cultural Independent Village should be able to develop tourism attractions based on local culture, crafts, and other local culinary delights. In its implementation, the Cultural Independent Village was accompanied by four related regional apparatus organizations, to hone and develop innovation and creativity which was manifested in cultural tourism events. In supporting the innovation of this art and cultural event, the village was guided by village facilitators. Based on (Decree of Governor of The Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 262/Kep/2016 Concerning Designation of Cultural Villages, 2016), there were 56 villages in Yogyakarta designated as cultural villages. However, this number had not been able to elevate cultural tourism in Yogyakarta significantly. By increasing the synergy of the four aspects, it was expected that the cultural village could be completely independent and could strengthen the image/brand of cultural tourism in Yogyakarta.

The role of a Cultural Independent Village should be optimized to explore local wisdom values that create a distinctive culture that can be developed and packaged in the form of cultural tourism, as stated by (Triputro & Pribudi, 2022) as follows:

"Local wisdom is characteristic of each region that has the potential to support the development of an area. The potential of local culture and wisdom in tourism development is part of the product of human creativity that has economic value. One of the efforts to develop tourism based on culture and local wisdom is packaging local culture in the form of festivals and local cultural events"

The findings showed that cultural villages had extensive potential to be developed into cultural tourism destinations. Human resources played an important role in innovating in developing local wisdom values into



quality cultural tourism products/activities. Considering that most of the villages in Yogyakarta have historical value and cultural artifacts that can be explored and developed using special funds. The strategy for developing cultural tourism can be carried out, among others, by developing cultural attractions that maintain regional identity, preserving historic buildings as cultural heritage buildings, improving infrastructures, improving tourism-supporting facilities, and involving the participation of the local community (Choirunnisa, Karmilah, Islam, & Agung, 2021).

## **CONCLUSION**

The development of cultural villages in the Special Region of Yogyakarta is carried out in three phases. The first phase is the cultural pilot village model, which is the level where the village is identifying the cultural values that exist in the village. Furthermore, coaching is carried out where existing cultural values can be packaged in cultural activities. In this phase, the district or city government is responsible for strengthening cultural actors. Cultural activities have not been able to fully attract tourists because at this level the community is still pioneering, generating aspirations and awareness of the cultural values that already exist in their village. The utilization of privilege funds at this level still includes building a cultural hall as a center for the conservation and development of local culture.

The second phase is the cultural village which is already marked by events, festivals, and cultural performances. These cultural activities begin to be used as an attraction that was able to bring in both domestic and foreign tourists. However, the implementation of these cultural events is only carried out at certain times and periods, for example, it is only held once a year. The development of cultural tourism in the cultural village model is still faced with limitations in all aspects, especially in terms of funding. Implementation of cultural events must be prepared in the form of a proposal submitted to the Provincial Cultural Office. Submitting a proposal also does not guarantee that the cultural event will be approved and funded by the government.

The last phase is a Cultural Independent Village which is characterized by community-based tourism activities which include culinary products and agricultural/plantation products.(Kornita & Jelly Zamaya, 2022) The emergence of these SMEs also stimulated village economic growth. However, not all communities get the benefits of this entrepreneurial activity. In this case, the emergence of entrepreneurial units is only absorbed by entrepreneurs, while most people who are not entrepreneurs have not had a positive impact on tourism business activities in the village. Communities in Cultural Independent Villages are fully aware of the cultural values and potential that exist in their village. The realization of four aspects of independent villages namely cultural villages, tourist villages, entrepreneurial villages, and villages that empower women has been implemented by the community. Even though the management aspect has not been fully implemented professionally. Hence, it has not been able to increase tourist visits, both domestic and foreign. The role of the facilitator and the Cultural Office has not been optimized, this can be seen in the facilitation process which is still incidental or has not been programmed in a systematic and sustainable manner, by reason of budget constraints. The facilitators need to emphasize more on branding and marketing aspects, facilitating the community to package tourism products and market them online and offline, so they can reach a wider target market.

In summary, quality cultural tourism could be developed when the cultural village has reached the third phase (Cultural Independent Village)(Anantadjaya, Rachmat, Nawangwulan, & Tanaya, 2022). In the final phase, the cultural village has become more autonomous and could carry out tourism functions within its management. As stated before, one of the main aspects of Cultural Independent Village Aspects is Tourism Village where the cultural assets are managed and packaged in the form of tourism products/activities and offered to the tourists which also generate income further improving the community's welfare. The first and second phases are not fully capable to strengthen cultural tourism due to certain limitations and requirements. To be culturally independent, villages need to evolve and improve over time. The facilitation program from Cultural Office needs to be comprehensively implemented to support the village on its first step to being more autonomous in managing all available resources in the villages.

## **REFERENCES**

- Alqarni, Wais, Ghifari, Muhammad Suhail, Asemki, Yuspani, Rizki, Muhammad, Safira, Bela, Nindiah, Isti, Rosa, Melida, Rahmi, Nuzulul, Fadhil, Restu, & Wahyuni, Wahyuni. (2022). Dynamics of Asymmetric Decentralization on the Implementation of Regional Autonomy in Aceh. *Journal of Governance and Public Policy*, 9(3), 185–194.
- Anantadjaya, Samuel P. D., Rachmat, Timotius A., Nawangwulan, Irma M., & Tanaya, P. Indra. (2022). The use of Importance Performance Analysis (IPA) on betawi cultural village in Setu Babakan, Jakarta, Indonesia. *Independent Journal of Management & Production*, 13(1), 210–233.
- Anderson, Wineaster. (2015). Cultural tourism and poverty alleviation in rural Kilimanjaro, Tanzania. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, 13(3), 208–224.

- Ardika, I. Wayan. (2007). *Pusaka budaya dan pariwisata*. Pustaka Larasan.
- Asriandy, Ian. (2016). Strategi Pengembangan Obyek Wisata Air Terjun Bissapu di Kabupaten Bantaeng. *Skripsi (Tidak Diterbitkan)*. Makassar: UNHAS.
- Choirunnisa, I., Karmilah, M., Islam, U., & Agung, S. (2021). Strategi Pengembangan Pariwisata Budaya Studi Kasus: Kawasan Pecinan Lasem, Kampung Lawas Maspati, Desa Selumbung. *Jurnal Kajian Ruang*, 1(2), 89–109.
- Damayanti, Rully. (2005). Kawasan" Pusat Kota" Dalam Perkembangan Sejarah Perkotaan Di Jawa. *DIMENSI (Journal of Architecture and Built Environment)*, 33(1).
- Dirgahayani, Puspita. (2013). Environmental co-benefits of public transportation improvement initiative: the case of Trans-Jogja bus system in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 58, 74–81.
- Ibrahim, Abdul Halil Hi, Hafel, Muhlis, & Lamasi, Iryani S. (2018). Jailolo bay festival as a model for developing cultural tourism in West Halmahera. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research*, 7(9), 167–176.
- Kornita, Sri Endang, & Yelly Zamaya, Misdawita. (2022). A Study on The Development of Local Potential Leading Commodity for Regional Development in Sengingi Subdistrict, Kuantan Singingi Regency. *Journal of Positive School Psychology*, 8206–8218.
- Luo, Fen, Moyle, Brent D., Bao, Jigang, & Zhong, Yongde. (2016). The role of institutions in the production of space for tourism: National Forest Parks in China. *Forest Policy and Economics*, 70, 47–55.
- Mumford, Lewis. (2016). *The culture of cities*. Open Road Media.
- Phondani, P. C., Maikhuri, R. K., & Bisht, N. S. (2013). Endorsement of ethnomedicinal knowledge towards conservation in the context of changing socio-economic and cultural values of traditional communities around Binsar Wildlife Sanctuary in Uttarakhand, India. *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*, 26, 573–600.
- Supardal, Supardal, Triputro, Widodo, & Nugroho, Tri. (2022). CULTURAL BUREAUCRATIZATION BY IMPLEMENTING CULTURAL-INDEPENDENT VILLAGES ON THE PRIVILEGE OF THE SPECIAL REGION OF YOGYAKARTA. *International Journal of Social Science*, 2(1), 1197–1210.
- Triputro, Widodo, & Pribudi, Anggarani. (2022). Cultural-Independent Village: Towards Village Autonomy in A Cultural and Tourism Village in Yogyakarta. *International Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities Invention*, 9(08), 7126–7173.