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ABSTRACT
This study aims to study the existence of a coalition of actors in the formulation of policies on land acquisition for the development of tourism region of Mandalika Resort in Central Lombok. This study is qualitative by design with the determination technique was through snowball informants. In collecting the data, non-participant observation was conducted along with in-depth interviews and documentation. Data analysis techniques was performed through Miles-Huberman-Saldana’s interactive model, and tests of the data validity include credibility, dependability, transferability, and conformability. The results of this study revealed that the coalition of actors in the formulation of policies was simply drafted by the Local Government and Regional Company in the form of a vertical coalition that puts the regional company as the patron while the local government as the client. This happened because of the local government’s dependence upon the capital owned by the regional companies. The results of this study concluded that if the coalition of actors in the formulation of policies consisted of only government and private sectors, this may open chance for capitalization policies that could harm the public interests and only give benefits to the owners of capital in this business sector.
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1. BACKGROUND

Tourism sector is vital private industry and becomes the third largest business in the world just after oil and telecommunications and automotive technology (Pendit, 2011). Tourism is considered as lucrative sector which is able to provide rapid economic growth in terms of employment, income, living standard, and also enable other sector such as in terms of the state revenue (Simatupang, 2009). Strategic role of the tourism sector to the economic growth in various tourist destinations, World Tourism Travel Council has placed the global tourism industry scale reaching around 11% of global GDP in 2014 (Kreishan, 2010).

One region that has experienced the largest growth in tourism sector according to World Tourism Organization (WTO) is Asian region (Karim, 2008). Among the Asian countries that have advantaged as tourist destinations and favorite destination of tourists’ visit based on the result of world tourism official site Trip Advisor are namely Thailand with Ko Tao Islands, Phuket, Koh Samui, Ko Lanta, Koh Phangan; the Philippines with Boracay and Palawan Islands; Malaysia with Langkawi Island; and Indonesia with Bali and Lombok (Indonesia Today, May 27, 2015).

Although the tourism sector in Asia has been considered as the most growing, but there are differences on policies for tourism in Asian countries. In Malaysia (Awang & Aziz, 2011), the policies on development of the tourism sector are mostly still controlled by the government, both at central and regional government levels. In Thailand (Sin & Minca, 2014), meanwhile, the management of tourism sector policies have been more delegated to the community. In Indonesia (Wever et al, 2012), on the other hand, the management of tourism sector has been decentralized into regional authority.

The decentralized policies on tourism sector management in Indonesia, however, have caused several problems at the local level due to the process of policy-making in the local governments has not empowered the community, especially the poor (Wever et al, 2012). Among these issues is the policy on land acquisition for the development of tourism region that have caused marginalization for the society because they are losing their fields as the source of their living as well as places of residence (Sidemen, 2012). Such issues like unclear status of land ownership (property title) (Wahyono, 2003), the interests of particular groups, the process of assessment and compensation are not transparently done and without involvement of the community, at the end have triggered the public rejection to the policies on land acquisition (Manoppo, 2012).

These phenomena, thus, have inhibited the process of tourism development in the region.

The issue of land acquisition for the development of regional tourism region is also found in the Mandalika Resort area in District of Central Lombok, which is it is vital to the development of tourism sector in the Province of West Nusa Tenggara (NTB). Mandalika Resort area is one integrated development program on tourism sector which is currently under consideration from the government as well as investors (Lombok Post, June 1st, 2013). The introduction of Master Plan for the Acceleration and Expansion of Indonesian Economic Development (or well-known as MP3EI) which puts West Nusa Tenggara as the new gateway to national tourism (Department of Tourism and Culture of NTB, 2013). Additionally, the airport in Lombok from the City of Mataram is removed to District of Central Lombok and also the changing status of the airport from domestic airport to Lombok International Airport (BIL) operating since October 2011, has encouraged the local government to pay special attention to the development of tourism sector in this region, especially Mandalika Resort. Through the support of MP3EI Program, Mandalika Resort area has been designed as an integrated tourism and become one of the mega projects of tourism development on the Lombok Island which cost around IDR 30 Trillion (Lombok Post, March 19th, 2012). In addition, based on Government Regulation (PP) Number 52 of 2014, Mandalika Resort area is designated as a special economic zone (Lombok Post, August 11th, 2014).

Unfortunately, the plan of the local government to develop the Mandalika Resort tourism area does not have positive reception from the community, but rather there is rejection and opposition to the policy on the land acquisition in the region. The people find that the policy of land acquisition issued by the regional government seems as a form of stealing the land from the community. They also claim that there is still an area of 135 hectares belonging to the community that has not been released, but the land has already been fenced by MNC Land and PT Gobel International, including PT Atrika and PT Sadana Arif Nusa which are the construction business partner of PT. BTDC as the company appointed by the Local Government to develop Mandalika Resort area. In addition, the policy of land acquisition is considered by the people as a form of marginalization of communities because it has caused thousands of people to be evicted from the land they have been farming for years (Lombok Post, December 11th, 2013).
The process of marginalization of the local communities is due to contradiction between the policy of land acquisition for the development of the tourism region of Mandalika Resort and the mandate contained in the constitution of the regional administration, i.e. Law Number 22 of 1999, Law Number 23 of 2014, and the constitutional mandate of tourism management area listed in Law Number 10 of 2009, of which the essence has put local communities as part of the main actors in every policy with the target area of every development of regional tourism policy should be oriented to improve the welfare of local communities.

Marginalization of communities as policy actors is contradicted with the theory of policy formulation (Lindblom, 1986), where the policy formulation must observe and analyze various aspects and interests and involve many relevant and interest groups. Formulation of policies conducted elitist by positioning the government as a group of elite, and it is considered to be able to act in an environment that is marked by mass apathy, information ambiguity, so that the masses are passive (Henry, 1975) has been proved to be increasingly make communities more reactive in responding government’s policies. The dominance of government as an actor controlling the formulation of policy because they are considered as a group of professionals, who have the technical capacity to formulate public policies in better way and it is oriented to the public interest (Goerl in Abdul Wahab, 1991). The reality, however, creates policy that ignores the values interests of the community. The policy making by the elitists will only give a policy decision that embodies the optimum desire and the values of the interests of the ruling elite (Islamy, 2009).

The existence of public rejection to the policy decision becomes an indicator of poor performance of policy formulation at the local government level, and this is controlled only by the involved elite actors (Hamka & Burhan, 2013). The process of policy formulation conducted by the elitist, in fact, is more likely to make policies that are oriented to the interests of certain elite groups rather than the interests of the society (Henry, 1975). This means that state policies are not always motivated by the expectation of the public welfare (Ansari, 2004), but sometimes it is created to serve the interests of certain political elites (Islamy, 2009). The impartiality of the state to the society in the elitist formulation of policies is contrary to the state’s function; it is also found in the theory of the Social Contract which is considered as a representation of the interests of the community to get the confidence of the public welfare through various intervention policies (Marzali, 2012), or in the theory of state power (Hegel in Gramsci, 1999) as a representative institution of public interest or the people themselves understand the most the will of the people, because it was built on the basis of ethical relationship of harmony that exists in the elements of the community.

Based on the theory of power settings above that the existence of the state in the process of policy formulation is not regarded as a representation that voluntarily defend the interests of society, but a defender of the interests of the coalition that provides profits for themselves. While the actor is a way coalition of actors in the face of force or domination of actors in order to compete to dominate in each policy domain (Sabatier, 1991). Finally, the selection of policy alternatives, policy decision makers come from bargaining of interests among the coalition actors (Anderson, 1984). The result of policy decisions are determined by the constellation of forces and a strong source of the interests of the actors involved in the coalition and the adjustment process of each partisan (Lindblom, 1979).

Assessing the coalition of actors in the formulation of policy may give an idea of the typology of the actors, resource of the actors, forms of engagement among the actors, the interest of behaviors and their preferences in articulating the interests of the policy being made (Parson, 1995). This understanding is based on the fact that a policy is a political decision that is formulated, as it is said by David Easton (Winarno, 2008) as a the “ruler” in a political system which generally consists of sub supra political structure (government) and the sub infra political structure (private and civil society). Thus, the policy is a collective political decision of a political compromise (Putra, 2003) among the actors involved and the coalition as the formulator (Lindblom, 1986).

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This is a policy research which is intended to analyze the presence of the existing process of the formulation of a policy and understand the behaviors of the involved actors in during the process of policy-making. Therefore, this policy research is placed on understanding the study “about” policies, i.e. policy research in order to assess one process of policy formulation that has existed or been made (Danim, 2000). Based on the understanding of the above study, the paradigm adopted by the researchers is constructivism with the conception that knowledge and truth are created, not discovered (Schwandt in Muhadjir, 2000), so
that the orientation of this research is to build knowledge (Bakri, 2003). The imposition of the constructivism is intended to do interpretive experience as a result of reflection or dialectic through empathetic and interactive ways between researchers and research subjects (Muhadjir, 2000).

In terms of operation, the study was conducted with the working mechanism of descriptive qualitative research, namely in-depth on the independent variable and used natural background (naturalistic), without giving any treatment on the variables being studied (Sugiono, 2001) with the intention to understand the phenomenon behind the object being studied by describing in the form of words and involving a variety of languages with the existing data collection methods (Moleong, 2007), i.e. observation, interviews, and documentation.

In order to ensure that the data collected is the data were precisely as needed to answer the research problems, the process of data analysis in this research was conducted since and each researcher obtained the data. The model of the data analysis process mentioned above referred to the model by Miles, Huberman, and Saldana (2014) called interactive model consisting of three stages, namely (a) condensation of data, (b) presentation of the data, and (c) making conclusion and verification. To avoid biased data, it requires testing the validity of the data. The criteria used in this study in order to test the validity of the data collected in this study consisted of four criteria, namely degree of confidence (credibility), transferability, dependence, and conformability (Moleong, 1999).

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The formulation of policy process of land acquisition for the development of the tourism area of Mandalika Resort in Central Lombok regency, however, was seen done undemocratic, in which the relevant groups from the local government were to reduce the role of society by not involving them to play a role as an actor in the formulation process of land acquisition. The process of public making was supposed to go properly and that policy decisions be legitimate if the relationship between the actors as the stakeholders in balance without any particular actor deliberate efforts to reduce the function and role of other actors in order to advocate for their own interests.

The policy formulation is basically a process to get the best choice of action in achieving public objectives (Islamy, 2009). The formulation of public policy is at the core of the policy process as at this phase, the conditions and limitations of the policy are formulated and will be implemented later (Nugroho, 2012). Therefore, public policy is regarded as a strategic phase for policy actors to articulate their interests, so that the formulation of public policy into the area of the legitimacy of the values of the interests of the actors involved in it (Wibawa, 1994). While the existence of values in the formulation of policy is the end of the public policy process (Kraft & Furlong in Islamy, 2004), and the diversity of the values of the interests of the actors become the factor that may influence the process of policy-making, such as difficult process of the formulation and elitist policy (Darwis, 2011).

In a democratic system of government (Sjahri et al, 2014), the presence of actors in the policy making process is no longer the sole authority of the government (Suharto, 2006). But there should be involvement from other elements such as private sector and civil society, despite the final decision of the policy remains under the government (Darwin, 2002). Despite the presence of actors outside government, the actors are often called non-formal or informal characters (Islamy, 2009), but their influences in influencing the decision of the policy by the government are often quite significant (Ibrahim, 2013).

If there is an attempt to make a reduction in the functions and roles of other actors (Iswara, 2013), then there will be actors whose interests were impaired and could ultimately lead to an attempt of rejection to any decision for the policy (Belletti et al, 2015). It refers to what is proposed by Allen and Kilvington (2004) that stakeholders are people or groups who have interests respectively against the public policy. Therefore, to avoid such opposing action from the society to the decision of the policy (Nunkoo and Smith, 2013), there should be public involvement in the formulation of policies of land acquisition for the development of tourism area of Mandalika Resort in Central Lombok. This is because the society is also as part of the stakeholder policy equitably as a form of political recognition and empowerment, because they were the most knowledgeable to the cases and will be articulated in through the channels during the formulation process of policy (Gelgel, 2009).

But, the close relationship between the state and the private sector (Grindle, 1991), often make policies defined by the state over sometimes support the private interests rather than public (Iswara, 2013). With the
The strength of its capital, the private sector has the power to control the state policy (Habibullah, 2009). The state has become a tool for the investors to realize their business interests (Hamdi, 2014), so that the state policy is a reflection of the interests of the owners of the capital (Grindle, 1991). In this case, according to Marxist theory (Gramsci, 1999) that the state as being an instrument of the single ruling class.

In relation to the public rejection of the policy of land acquisition in the tourism area of Mandalika Resort is very logical (Suryash, 2003), because the local communities that act as fundamental determinant of the regional tourism development, so that any policies related to the existence of regional tourism must necessarily be formulated with the involvement of the local communities (Nunkoo and Smith, 2013).

The emergence of problems was due to the policy, as in the case of public rejection against the decision of land acquisition policy for the development of tourism area Mandalika Resort, explained that in the process of formulating the policy of which government should have played significant role to defend the public interests (Belletti et al, 2015) failed there was as a party, however, that did marginalization of existence of the society. As a result, the decision of the policy taken by the government was not based on the will of the public interest (Sjarhir et al, 2014), but it was such order of the interest of particular groups (Shehu et all, 2013). In this case, according Miliband (1969), the country was in a capitalist society because the government is ruled by certain class of capital owners.

Coalition of Local Government of Central Lombok with the Provincial Government and PT. LTDC for land acquisition from the public control may be another mechanism played by the actors in articulating their interests in the formulation process of the policy. In policy making the concept of a coalition pays attention to how the policy has emerged from the interplay between people and organizations and provides a more informal image about how the “real” policy was conducted under urgent conditions (Parson, 2011). Policy coalition by Walter Kickert, Klijn, and Joop is a network of policy (Yakin et al, 2012) which is a form of social relations between actors who are mutually dependent in the interests through the establishment of opinion by the elites (Carlsson, 2000).

Coalition of actors is a group of policy makers in the sub-system policy (Sabatier, 1993) which consists of actors from a number of private institutions as well as governments at all levels of government organizations dealing on the basis of trust on the achievement of common objectives (Howlett & Ramesh, 1995). In relation to the formulation of policies of land acquisition for the development of tourism area of Mandalika Resort, the coalition of actors in the sub-system policy was played the Local Government and PT. LTDC under the common belief or deep/normative core (Weible & Sabatier, 2007), that the control over the land by the community is considered as a problem for the development of Mandalika Resort area, so that it was emerging to formulate the policy of land acquisition.

As the presence of common beliefs and mutual dependency towards the policy and resources (Parsons, 2005) has made the local government would prefer a coalition with the private sector namely PT. LTDC than coalition with groups of people with different beliefs upon the ownership of the land, while the coalition’s advocacy in policy may appear at all levels of policy governance structure, to the national, regional, and local governments (Howlett & Ramesh, 1995). However, in the formulation of policies of land acquisition for the development of the tourism area of Mandalika Resort, a coalition of actors occurred between levels Provincial Government and Local Government, so that the shape of the coalition was vertical, which was a coalition of actors that goes disproportionately because one party has dominance which is more powerful than the other, or it occurs patron-client relationship (Kusnadi, 2000), which is between the Provincial Government and PT. LTDC (patron) provides financial assistance to the Government of Central Lombok (as the client) with the assistance of the land relinquishment around Mandalika Resort area from the communities.

The dominance of the power of the coalition between government and private actors in the formulation of any policies may keep getting stronger and elitist (Suwitri, 2011) if there is not any public involvement through coalition of civil society as the actors (Sabatier, 1993). Therefore, the consideration towards certain values before the policy being decided by the elite's perspective is more likely than the values desired by the public as the sovereign stakeholders (Biaggio, 2015). As the result, any public policies are not sensitive to the “public”. The considerations were all based on rational choices from the elites that are likely contradictory with the values as needed and desired by the public. In the perspective of the elite theory, Wright Mills (1959) argued that public policy can be seen as the values and choices of the ruling elites. This is in line with the views by Marx (Magnis-Suseno, 1991) that the state does not serve the public interest, but
only serves the interests of those specific social classes, so that the state becomes a tool of dominant classes to fight and defend their position, or else that the state is an expression politics of the dominant classes.

Coalition of actors between state and the private sector in the formulation of policy and the decision of the policy tends to defend private interests (Grindle, 1991) is in contrary with the functions of the state as presented by Hegel (Gramsci, 1999) who thinks that the state as an institution that is most aware of the will of the individuals, because the state objectively expresses what the people only consider as something subjective. Other inquiry about state is by Carnoy (Gramsci, 1999) that the state is a representation of a social collectivity that stands above classes of particular interests and ensures that the competition between individuals and groups should be maintained on a regular basis.

The exchange of strength and power with direct reciprocity is the orientation of the actors in the coalition circles. While sub-system policies are often composed of many coalitions who then compete to dominate in each policy domain (Sabatier & Jenkins, 1988). These conditions have made the conflict inevitable. Coalition of advocacy is a coalition of groups united by some shared beliefs about a particular issue or problem. This coalition is one of the ways in which the dynamics of groups and coalitions can work to defeat the power of dominant interests.

The dominance of these actors will be maintained as long as there is no coalition of actors who are built to face the domination of this actor (Suwitri, 2011). Thus, to prevent the domination of the actors in the formulation of policies, it must be built a coalition of actors to confront the dominant actors (Belletti et al, 2015). However, the emergence of many coalitions of actors in one policy making may create frictions which are unavoidable (Soe'aidy, 2003), and to reconcile the conflicts requires an intermediate broker who has the authority to make decisions on conflicts of interest coalition policy actors (Sabatier & Jenkins, 1993). In the context of the formulation of policy that is full of conflict of interest (Lindblom, 1986), the presence of broker policy in the mindset Sabatier & Jenkins (Sawitri, 2011) act as curative, and the formulation should be changed into preventive action. In the policy level, at the local level, the mediator of this policy can be played by local legislative bodies with the function of checking and balancing against the local authorities.

4. CONCLUSION

The formulation of policy which is only carried out by the coalition of authorities and entrepreneurs as private sector was not the proper policymaking mechanism. It is because instead of getting support, this mechanism actually will face public rejection because the decision of the policy is not oriented to the public interest, but only for the sake of coalition of group actors. In a democratic country, public policy-making process must be conducted through a critical interaction between stakeholders of public policy. They discuss mutual interests of the public openly without coercion or domination of certain actors, so it should be held for the public welfare. These conditions allow the growth of potential of the environment and atmosphere of communicative democratic society, so that the public policy established by the government has the support of all the interest groups (stakeholders) of the policy.
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