



---

## CULTURAL BUREAUCRATIZATION BY IMPLEMENTING CULTURAL-INDEPENDENT VILLAGES ON THE PRIVILEGE OF THE SPECIAL REGION OF YOGYAKARTA

By

Supardal<sup>1</sup>, Widodo Triputro<sup>2</sup>, Tri Nugroho<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Faculty of Public Administration, High School Village Development Community “APMD” Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Email: <sup>1</sup>[gusdal66@gmail.com](mailto:gusdal66@gmail.com), <sup>2</sup>[widodotriputro@yahoo.com](mailto:widodotriputro@yahoo.com), <sup>3</sup>[trinugroho822@gmail.com](mailto:trinugroho822@gmail.com)

---

### Article Info

#### Article history:

Received April 11, 2022

Revised April 23, 2022

Accepted May 28, 2022

---

#### Keywords:

Cultural-Independent Village;  
Bureaucratization; Privilege  
Fund; Culture.

---

### ABSTRACT

As a follow-up to the privileges of Yogyakarta in the context of village development through Governor Regulation No.93 of 2020 concerning Cultural-Independent Villages, the government of Yogyakarta states that a village is a model for a plenary village with integrity and innovation that is enlightened and sovereign. The implementation of cultural villages must develop four pillars: the cultural village, the tourist village, the village-preneur, and the prima/women's role village. To prosper the village community in the context of the privileged culture of Yogyakarta, the four pillars must be developed optimally. For this purpose, cultural-independent villages receive privilege funds between 1 and 1.5 billion rupiahs per year. Consequently, a problem arises: Can the cultural-independent village policy prosper the villagers? Or, is it true that the cultural bureaucratization can realize a plenary village through these four pillars? To examine these problems, researcher(s) collected data through interviews with stakeholders such as the *Kundho Kabudayan* (Department of Culture) apparatus, cultural village managers or village government, and cultural actors. Furthermore, the data were confirmed with document data so that they were more comprehensive to be analyzed qualitatively and in-depth related to the phenomenon of implementing cultural-independent villages and the dynamics. The results show that, in realizing villages with integrity and innovation that are enlightened and sovereign as an indicator of a cultural-independent village, there was no room to develop following the freedom and independence of the village. However, the villages had been determined by regional apparatus organizations with their standards in the forms of cultural village, tourism village, village-preneur, and prima/women's role village. Another fact is that there is a cultural bureaucratization by the regional apparatus organizations appointed to the cultural-independent villages so that the villages lose their independence in developing their respective cultures, which are pretty diverse in customs and culture. Likewise, to improve the welfare of the people, a cultural-independent village does not guarantee the economic welfare of the community; in other words, a village with the status of a cultural-independent village may not necessarily have an impact on reducing poverty.

*This is an open access article under the [CC BY-SA](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/) license.*



---

### Corresponding Author:

Supardal

Faculty of Public Administration, Sekolah Tinggi Pembangunan Masyarakat Desa APMD, Yogyakarta, Indonesia

Email: [gusdal66@gmail.com](mailto:gusdal66@gmail.com)

---

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The concept of a cultural-independent village is a perfect model village in the context of the development of a cultural village. Previously, after the enactment of Law Number 13 of 2012 concerning the Privileges of Yogyakarta, everything became special; special country, and special people (special local regulations, and special funds too). In the Special Region of Yogyakarta, there are villages and sub-districts. Since 2018, the term *village* has changed to *kalurahan* with the mandate of the Special Local Regulation of the Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 1 of 2018 concerning the Institutions of the Government of the Special Region of Yogyakarta. To make a category of village development in a cultural context, a cultural village was born based on Governor Regulation No.36 of 2014 concerning Cultural Villages.

The establishment of a plenary village with the highest category is called the cultural-independent village, based on Governor Regulation No.93 of 2020 concerning Cultural-Independent Villages. In 2021, there were ten candidates for cultural-independent villages. A cultural-independent village is enlightened, sovereign, with integrity and innovation in living and actualizing particular values through utilizing all the wealth of resources and culture it has. A cultural-independent village is obliged to develop four sectors in order to achieve the welfare of the village people, and those are cultural village, tourist village, village-preneur, and Prima (tough women) village; involving four OPDs under the coordination of the Department of Culture of the Special Region of Yogyakarta as the facilitator and companion for the cultural-independent villages' activities.

To support the implementation of the cultural-independent village program and activity, the government of the Special Region of Yogyakarta will provide annual privilege funding assistance of between 1 and 1.5 billion rupiah to each cultural-independent village. The realization of these funds is to support the cultural village activities, such as cultural halls, gamelan, and others, to support tourist villages to fund the activities of tourism awareness groups (POKDARWIS ~*Ind.*) in developing tourist villages, as well as to develop village-preneur by forming SMEs and other business groups, also to encourage tough women to pioneer culinary, craft, health, and other productive activities. The problem is: Within the context of cultural-independent villages, can cultural bureaucratization improve welfare as set out in the objectives? Or, can it reduce poverty in the Special Region of Yogyakarta?

## 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

### 2.1. Concept of Cultural Conservation

One authority for the privilege of the Special Region of Yogyakarta is the authority of culture. Article 31 states that culture is held to maintain and develop the results of creativity, taste, initiative, and work in the form of values, knowledge, norms, customs, objects, arts, and noble traditions rooted in the people of the Special Region of Yogyakarta (Law of Privilege of the Special Region of Yogyakarta), related to cultural authority to be able to preserve customs, cultural values, and local wisdom (Endah Juniarti, 2017). In this context, various policies have been made regulating the processes and mechanisms for developing local or village culture.

Cultural preservation is an extensive system and has various components related to the subsystems of life in society. Culture is the forerunner of society (Koentjaraningrat, 1984). Culture is made by society. There is no society with no culture. Almost all human actions are cultural. The essence of cultural preservation itself is not just preserving something from extinction or simply making it durable. However, the development of culture itself is based on past cultural values, which now have no longer left any traces due to the element of time.

Apart from being ideologically charged as a movement to strengthen culture, history, and identity (Lewis, 1983), cultural preservation is also a growing public concern to encourage the emergence of a sense of belonging to the same past among community members (Smith, 1996). Thus, cultural preservation plays a role in reviving the values of local wisdom to provide a spirit of encouraging community members for contemporary development. Even though this is not easy because times have changed a lot with the influence of technology being very intensive, even dominating society. Several obstacles are still found in preserving local culture through cultural villages, such as issues of human resources, institutions, and infrastructure (Rochayanti & Triwardani, 2013). For the case of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, it is pursued by institutionalizing and bureaucratizing culture with a set of policies. The essential things are mapping the potential, coaching, mentoring, building synergies, and implementing village governance into a modern organization (Nur Arifah, 2018). The development of a cultural-independent village must collaborate with the development of existing technology

### 2.2. Concept of Cultural Bureaucratization

The concept of cultural bureaucratization implies a process of formal cultural regulation through a set of regional regulations and policies, particularly in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. Thus, culture is developed through local government regulations, and policies, so unregulated cultural elements should not be developed. Based on Law Number 13 of 2012 concerning the Privileges of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, Yogyakarta has the privileged authority as stipulated in Article 7 paragraph 2 that one of the authorities is cultural affairs. In Article 31, paragraph 1,



it is emphasized that cultural authority is held to maintain and develop the results of creativity, taste, initiative, and work in the form of values, knowledge, norms, customs, objects, arts, and noble traditions rooted in the people of the Special Region of Yogyakarta.

Based on the Regulation of the Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 3 of 2017 concerning the Maintenance and Development of Culture, the Article 5 regulates cultural objects consisting of (a) cultural values, (b) knowledge and technology, (c) language, (d) customs, (e) noble traditions, (f) objects, and (g) art. Such cultural objects are sourced from the Sultanate, the Duchy, and the society. The maintenance and development of culture aim to (1) strengthen the character and identity of the community, (2) realize the maintenance of cultural values of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, (3) develop the culture to increase cultural resilience and the cultural contribution of the Special Region of Yogyakarta amid world civilization, (4) accomplish equal access to cultural activities and increasing the appreciation of art and creativity in cultural works, and (5) improve the welfare of the community.

In carrying out privilege affairs, the Government of the Special Region of Yogyakarta carries out itself and assigns some privileges matters to the Regency/City Government and/or Village Government. Thus, the Government of the Special Region of Yogyakarta has established the Institution of the Regional Government of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, which is stipulated in the Special Region Regulation Number 1 of 2018. Then, the assignment of some privileges to the Regency/City Government and/or Village Government has been stipulated by the Regulation of the Governor of the Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 25 of 2019 concerning Institutional Guidelines for Privileges in Regency/City and Village Governments, as amended by Regulation of the Governor of the Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 30 of 2021.

Based on the Governor's Regulation, regency/city Regional Regulations in the Special Region of Yogyakarta are constructed, which regulate the administrative institutions of the village typical of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, with nomenclatures such as Village Secretary, Head of Administrative Affairs, Head of Financial Affairs, Planning Affairs, Head of Government Section, Head of Welfare Section, Head of Service Section, and Hamlet. The village administration institution carries out the assignment of some privileges, one of which is cultural affairs. Furthermore, privileged affairs can be carried out by the village, and its funding is sourced from the Privileges Fund.

### 2.3. Profile of Cultural-Independent Villages

The concept of an Independent Culture Village has been designed since 2018. However, a new Governor Regulation was signed on 9 November 2020, following Governor Regulation No.93 of 2020 concerning Cultural Independent Villages. In 2021, there will be ten candidates for the Cultural Independent Village. Cultural Independent Village is enlightened, sovereign, with integrity, and innovative in living and actualizing particular values through utilizing all the wealth of resources and culture it has. Thus, a cultural-independent village is an ideal village term that privilege funds support. Hence, villages in the Special Region that receive privilege assistance funds are villages with the predicate of cultural-independent villages. The task of the local government through the OPD in the Province and Regency/City is to facilitate and encourage villages to upgrade from a cultural village to a cultural-independent village.

The Regulation of the Governor of the Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 93 of 2020 concerning Cultural-Independent Villages signed on 9 November 2020 is a guideline for implementing Cultural-Independent Villages in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. As a foundation for forming a cultural-independent village, it must be a reference for village development. According to the results of a 2018 study by the Cultural Office of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, a Cultural-Independent Village is an autonomous village that can meet its own needs through the utilization of all internal and external (supra-village) resources of the village to actualize, develop, and conserve the wealth of cultural potential (objects and/or non-objects) that they have through the active participation of citizens in carrying out community development and empowerment (Kedaulatan Rakyat, 20 November 2020, p.11).

The Cultural-Independent Village establishment was motivated by the implementation of regional autonomy in 2001, which was not as expected (Paniradya Kaistimewaan of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, 2020). As a special region in the privileged frame, the Special Region of Yogyakarta has not brought encouraging economic development. In terms of regional specificity, it is expected to accelerate economic growth. The problem with local government is that there is still a sectoral ego between OPDs that makes economic, social, and cultural development unhealthy, unfair, and inefficient from the regional point of view and orientation of development goals. Thus, development has not had much impact on increasing the community's income. A study from the drafting team for the Grand Design of the Cultural-Independent Villages of the Special Region of Yogyakarta in 2020 mentions the impact of the OPD sectoral ego, namely the use of a budget that becomes wasteful (inefficient and ineffective). This is due to a lack of cooperation and synergy in preparing development programs, resulting in high costs in the development process, especially in villages which are the targets and objects of sectoral programs from various OPDs. So, the cultural-independent village becomes a model for a plenary village funded from the privileged fund budget, with the hope of accelerating people's

welfare, by integrating four fields, namely cultural village, tourist village, village-preneur, and Prima village, involving four OPDs under the coordination of the Department of Culture of the Special Region of Yogyakarta.

The absorption of poverty alleviation funds has not reached the community, which is indicated by the relatively high poverty level in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. On the other hand, the bureaucracy widely uses the absorption of funds to support the village guidance and supervision process. Planning and development processes and village assistance do not experience good cohesion between OPD and villages as subjects and objects of development. On the contrary, OPD shows sectoral ego in village assistance. This is because not all OPDs have a clear framework to encourage holistic, comprehensive, and measurable village development. Along the way, this process continues so that the expected impact of development results will reach the people for the best. The ideal of the village is still seen from the perspective of each OPD, so there is no ideal form or approach to the plenary village development that is wanted to refer to. This sectoral problem is finally trapped in the program and performance appraisal. For this reason, in the context of implementing a culturally independent village, 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 (Paniradya Kaistimewaan of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, 2020). For this reason, it is necessary to develop a common mindset in looking at the village. Hence, it has similar policy steps toward culturally independent villages. More importantly, OPD should not burden the village with managing a culturally independent village, thus reducing the meaning of independence itself.

Efforts to develop a culturally independent village are based on the principle that Cultural-Independent Village is a Development Goal in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. In this case, there is an initiation from the regional government to initiate a cross-OPD village development pilot project, including Cultural Village (Cultural Department), Tourism Village (Tourism Department), Prima Village (Department of Women Empowerment, Child Protection, and Population Control), Village-Preneur (Department of Cooperatives & SMEs). In this context, there is a need for indicators of the success of culturally independent village management as a complete village model within the framework of the privileges of the Special Region of Yogyakarta. This is important because all financing for cultural-independent villages and cultural villages is sourced from the state budget or public money. Standards and procedures for developing cultural-independent villages must also be made, as is the use of village funds by the village government so that they can be transparent and accountable. The biggest challenge in implementing an Independent Cultural Village lies in reversing the top-down development paradigm base into a development paradigm that positions village development initiatives from the bottom. The reversal of the development paradigm must also occur from the jargon/rhetoric of developing villages to the praxis of developed villages, from the slogan improving communities to improved communities. This is also parallel with the spirit of Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages, so it has a strong foundation legally. Implementing the Village Law does not conflict with the spirit of privilege, which wants to establish village independence through a culturally independent village scheme. Villages must be positioned independently and freely to design development plans based on their community initiatives.

The objectives of developing Cultural-Independent Villages are: to realize village independence for the welfare of rural communities through cultural development, tourism, inclusive participation of women, development of village entrepreneurs, and food security (Paniradya Kaistimewaan of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, 2020); to strengthen the potential of the village as a fortress of cultural preservation in the face of global flows; to strengthen the village institutional system to reduce poverty through food security, entrepreneurship, and tourism; to strengthen the village information system as a space for village socialization, promotion, and marketing; to strengthen the capacity of village managers and organizations at the village level in terms of intellectual and skill in village management; and to strengthen the values and life of the community in realizing security and peace. To achieve the target of the 2017-2022 RPJMD (Regional Medium-Term Development Plan), in which there will be 20 Cultural-Independent Villages in 2022, the Yogyakarta Regional Government conducted training and mentoring for 10 Cultural-Independent Villages in 2020. The Yogyakarta regional government needed hard work to make it happen because only a few complete villages had four village categories (Tourism, Culture, Preneur, Prima). The completed villages were Putat, Patuk district, Bejiharjo, Karangmojo district, and Gunung Kidul. For this reason, training and institutional assistance have always been carried out intensely. Through the Cultural-Independent Village Institution, it is hoped that the village can become the granary of the village economy (economic aspect), village cultural circle (an aspect of village cultural sustainability), and gather village-preneur (community independence) (Arif Sulfiantonno, M.Agr., M.S.I, 18 November 2020).

#### 2.4. Special Financial Assistance from the Privilege Fund

In practice, the DAN AIS scheme for Cultural-Independent Villages is almost the same as the Village Fund, where each Cultural-Independent Village will receive DAN AIS transfer funds, namely BKK (Special Financial Assistance) of between 500 million to 1 billion rupiahs per village. The main objective of DAN AIS is to build economic growth for the community's welfare, specifically to support four areas: developing village culture, developing tourist



villages, realizing villagepreneurs (SMEs), and mobilizing the role of women to be active in the village economy. This is different from the use of village funds by the village government for village administration, development implementation, community development, and community empowerment. Since the object is the same, namely villagers, mapping and selection are needed to avoid overlapping programs and targets in program implementation; for this reason, the importance of program integration in the preparation of program planning in the village development planning forum.

To obtain the status of a culturally independent village, there are specific prerequisites for Culturally-Independent Villages and who oversees the Cultural Independent Villages. Regarding requirements for villages with cultural-independent village status, four Pillars of Cultural-Independent Villages are prerequisites when obtaining DANAIS, which is transferred to the village as BKK. The condition is that the village develops four pillars under the guidance of 4 OPD as follows:

1. The Pillar of Culture, under the assistance of the Cultural Office (Department of Culture) of the Special Region of Yogyakarta. In terms of culture, a village must be able to develop various potentials in various events to become a pattern that is preserved in supporting the development and aims to improve the welfare of villagers.
2. The Pillar of Tourism, under the assistance of the Tourism Office of the Special Region of Yogyakarta. In terms of tourism, a village must be able to develop a tourist village by exploring its potential. By developing a tourist village, it will be able to move the villagers' economy to create jobs and improve the villagers' economy.
3. The Pillar of PRIMA (Advanced Indonesian Women), under the assistance of the Department of Women Empowerment, Child Protection, and Population Control (DP3AP2) of the Special Region of Yogyakarta. In this case, a cultural-independent village must be able to mobilize women to support their family economy by being active in various economic activities. This is marked by the emergence of women's groups with economic activities such as culinary arts, crafts, and other economic activities.
4. The Pillar of ~Preneur, under the assistance of the Department of MSME and Cooperatives of the Special Region of Yogyakarta. In this case, a cultural-independent village must be able to develop community groups in entrepreneurial activities or business spirit. This is marked by the emergence of SME groups in villages, as well as networks of economic activity, as well as the emergence of online markets.

In developing the four economic pillars, cultural-independent villages are facilitated and accompanied by the involvement of Regional Government Organizations. In the village realm, there is also a need for synergy between several village institutions or stakeholders related to the four main prerequisite pillars. For this reason, cultural-independent villages must encourage the birth and role of village institutions such as the cultural village institution, humanists, artists, cultural village activists, cultural village facilitators, tourism awareness groups, heads of neighborhood association gathering, hamlet, empowerment, and welfare mobilizing team family, family income improvement efforts, MSMEs, village-owned enterprises, youth organizations, village community empowerment institutions, village consultative body, and village government. Thus, village institutions play a significant role in mobilizing the four pillars that are the targets of culturally independent villages: cultural village, tourist village, villagepreneur, and quite-active-women village.

The use of special assistance funds for cultural-independent villages must support the implementation of the four pillars of cultural-village development, namely cultural village, tourist village, villagepreneur village, and prima (women's role) villages. From the results of the FGD with the cultural village manager, the process of using the budget begins with each community group submitting a proposal under four areas. Furthermore, selected by the cultural village administrator and based on an agreement with the head of the village, it was decided that assistance for the development of the proposed field was decided. In practice, the proposal does not always receive DANAIS assistance following the amount submitted, with one consideration or another. Any funds given to community groups for these activities must be used according to their designation so that their accountability follows the proposed proposal. The weakness is that the planned programs have not been integrated with village government planning in the Village Government Work Plan, so each program seems to run separately.

A cultural-independent village is a form of Model Village within the framework of the privileges of Yogyakarta, which is managed in an integrated manner while still paying attention to the role of residents in its management. This integration is demonstrated by the role of all stakeholders, namely the government of the Special Region of Yogyakarta through the Village Apparatus Organization, the role of community groups of cultural-independent village administrators, sub-district administration, and the participation of villagers. Cultural-Independent Villages are vital because they have various strategic roles and can provide a specific village identity. The impact of the determination of the Model Village motivates increased awareness and participation of residents in the Cultural Independent Village. The ultimate goal of developing a culturally independent village must be to improve the

---

community's welfare. With the status of a culturally independent village, the welfare level of the village must be better than that of a cultural status village or cultural startup.

### 3. METHOD

The study of the implementation of the cultural-independent village policy used a qualitative approach since it relies more on the power of sensory observation to see the dynamics of the cultural-independent village phenomenon. According to Suwardi Endraswara (2003:16), a qualitative approach is more about adequately considering the five senses to see the culture that tends to change with changing times. Qualitative traditions follow cultural assumptions and data; in other words, qualitative cultural research is more flexible, non-fixed, reflective, and imaginative. According to Hendriansyah (2010), qualitative research is scientific research that aims to understand a phenomenon in a natural social context by prioritizing a process of deep communication interaction between researcher(s) and the phenomenon being studied. This approach relies more on the power of sensory observations to analyze the dynamics of the cultural-independent village phenomenon.

The selection of the qualitative approach with the case study method of the cultural-independent village was based on the aim of obtaining a complete, realistic, and in-depth description of the implementation of the cultural-independent village policy in the Province of the Special Region of Yogyakarta. The data used were primary data with interviews and focus group discussion (FGD) with the stakeholders of cultural-independent villages. The secondary data were obtained from the documents of the Department of Culture of the Special Region of Yogyakarta and cultural-independent villages, as well as publications on cultural-independent villages. The data were collected through observation, interviews, FGDs, and documentation. The research focus was carried out in FGD with the cultural village managers, performing arts workers, the community, and OPD assistants to the cultural-independent villages of the Special Region of Yogyakarta. To strengthen the data, government policies presented to the public were also displayed.

### 4. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

According to Governor Regulation No. 93 of 2020 concerning Cultural Independent Villages, what is meant by a Culturally Independent Village is a village that is enlightened, sovereign, with integrity, and innovative in living and actualizing its particular values through the utilization of all the wealth of resources and culture it has, by involving the active participation of citizens in the implementation of development and community empowerment to realize the preservation of the universe of creation, welfare, and tranquility of citizens in diversity in oneness.

The concept of being enlightened comes from ancient times, when several villages had a unique history and development, and the king was then given special rights. The king's special treatment of this village is usually due to the village head or his figure who has contributed to the king. A village with special treatment from the king is called a *Perdikan*. *Perdikan* comes from the word *merdeka*, *mahardika*, which means freedom, being enlightened. *Perdikan* means a village free from the obligation to pay taxes or tribute to the king. A *perdikan* was exempted from paying tribute to the kingdom because its founding figure was considered to have contributed to the kingdom, for example, helping to establish the kingdom, helping to defend the kingdom when the kingdom was attacked by enemies, helping to solve problems faced by the king or his family, and so on. That is, this enlightened village is a village that is given the freedom to develop its village based on various potentials it has to achieve the welfare of the villagers, in the sense that the supra-village government no longer dictates the village in the context of the village development, primarily through the existing OPD.

*Desa Mahardika*, or a village being enlightened, in Kartohadikoesoemo's interpretation (1994), is as follows: states that the meaning of the word *desa*, *dukuh*, *desi*, as well as *negara*, *nagari*, *nagoro*, comes from the Sanskrit language which means homeland, land of origin (Kartohadikoesoemo 1994). This means that the concept of an enlightened village is a village that has its own territory with the initiative and freedom of a small republic. Meanwhile, in another perspective, long before the independence of the Indonesian state, throughout Indonesia, there were legal community units that had certain territorial boundaries and were authorized to run their own households (Ndraha, 1991: 23). In this concept, the village as an area with specific boundaries has a government, and there is political authority and services to village residents.

A sovereign village is a village that has a system, authority, and customs in which the supra-village government does not intervene. In terms (Sudjatmiko, 2015), a village which means independence (*swadesi*) comes from a group of people who live in their place of birth, place of origin, or ancestral land, which refers to a single unit of life, with one unified norm, and has clear boundaries. Values and norms govern villages, and culture is passed down from generation to generation and continues to be maintained and enriched to live independently. This means that the village is a unitary legal area based on the history and customs of the community. So, sovereignty prioritizes the existence of a system based on customs that form independence in carrying out tasks to achieve the welfare of villagers.



A village with integrity is a village with all village leaders where people's actions are following the values, beliefs, and principles they teach; they are said to have integrity. Simply put, the quality of sincere people is only shown by their words and actions, not by those who can't keep their words. A sincere person is not a person who has many faces and looks that are adjusted to his motivations and interests. Village integrity is an essential personality for village leaders. According to Jacobs (1994), integrity emphasizes moral immutability, personal honesty, or honesty. Thus, village integrity will be realized if village actors, namely elites and residents, have the nature of personal honesty and moral greatness so that it shows the authority of village actors in carrying out the mandate given by the supra-village government, especially related to the use of an accountable and transparent budget.

According to the Ministry of Villages, the Village Innovation Program (PID) is a program that can improve the quality of life of rural communities, as well as increase people's knowledge and welfare. The PID stages have been carried out by both the Provincial and District Work Units, and organizations at the District (ICT) and District (TPID) levels have been formed. They have also been supported by the Activity Operational Fund (DOK). In general, the purpose of the Village Innovation Program is to encourage the use of more quality, effective, and efficient Village Funds through various development and empowerment activities of Village communities that are more innovative and sensitive to the needs of the Village community (Decree of the Minister of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration), Number 48 of 2018). Thus, an innovative village shows a village that can make breakthroughs and strategies to accelerate rural communities' development and empowerment.

Implementing the culturally independent village policy is simplified into four areas: cultural village, tourism village, entrepreneur village, and Prima village. A Cultural village means being able to develop the existing cultural potential. A tourism village means being able to develop existing tourism potential. Prima Village can increase women's participation through increasing economic productivity by utilizing all existing potential and involving all relevant cross-sector roles to create a prosperous family. Village-Preneur can grow village-scale business units managed by the villagers themselves through strengthening entrepreneurial knowledge and skills, improving product/service quality, added value, and competitiveness, aiming to improve the village economy and achieve living welfare.

Governor Regulation No. 93 of 2020 concerning Cultural Independent Villages, Article 3 states that Cultural Independent Villages are synergistic and harmonized programs/activities of Cultural Villages, Tourism Villages, Prima Villages, and Preneur Villages. The culturally independent village was determined because of its success in synergizing four activities: culture, tourism, prima (women's activities), and entrepreneur (developing SMEs). Meanwhile, in Article 5 paragraph 1, a Cultural Independent Village is formed from a Cultural Village in which there are tourism activities, empowerment of small and medium enterprises, and empowerment of women. The implementation of the independent village policy carried out by four Regional Apparatus Organizations that oversee and facilitate culturally independent villages has been able to realize the principles of a culturally independent village, such as the principle of being enlightened, village sovereignty, integrity, and village innovation; considering that the purpose of a culturally independent village is to create an enlightened village, a sovereign village, a village of integrity, and an innovative village.

Thus, measuring the success of a culturally independent village must be seen from the development of these four categories. First is the enlightened category, which looks at the freedom and independence of the village in managing government, services, and village development. Based on this indicator, most cultural-independent villages have not met the independence indicators because most villages still depend on the supra-village government through sectoral programs. Likewise, freedom in the sense of determining community initiative-based programs also cannot be run without the facilitation of the facilitators provided by the district Culture Office. This shows that not all culturally independent villages can be independent in implementing development programs to achieve community welfare.

Second, the sovereign category, which includes villages, must have a standard system, have complete authority, recognized customs, and be far from supra-village government intervention. Judging from these indicators, village sovereignty is still far from the requirements of this category because almost all village policies cannot be separated from government regulations. Thus, either directly or indirectly, the village is always regulated and intervened by the district, provincial, and central governments.

Third, the integrity village in a cultural-independent village, which can be described as the attitudes and actions of village officials or elites who show honesty, sincerity, and partiality to the villagers. Overall, not all village elites have integrity, especially in managing the existing budget in the village. There are still certain elite practices in implementing policies. Certain groups' interests still exist, so this practice is detrimental to the villagers. This policy orientation and structural distribution model show that the interests of the elite are more dominant than the interests of the villagers. Thus, the practice of integrity in a cultural-independent village still needs to be further improved so that

---

the predicate of a cultural-independent village is attached to the character of integrity in carrying out its duties and functions by existing laws and regulations.

Fourth, the title of an innovative village in a cultural-independent village also shows that some villages with the status of cultural-independent villages have not innovated and been creative with various strategies and breakthroughs to improve the welfare of the villagers. Cultural-independent villages are busy with various culturally independent village programs and their funding, so it seems that there is a formalization and bureaucratization of culture in the village; as a result, the village does not have sufficient time to develop village creativity and innovation in developing village potential to support the welfare of village residents. Thus, villages with statuses such as cultural or cultural-independent villages are busy serving local government organizations with their programs rather than innovating for village progress. This is called cultural bureaucratization, where the development of cultural villages is made on various rules and criteria that the government formally sets. Even when there are regencies that are a little innovative in managing cultural villages, they are also prohibited by the Provision through their Department of Culture, as stated by the Head of the Department as follows:

“Due to the absence of nomenclature prior to the stage of a cultural-independent village, the Department of Culture of the Special Region of Yogyakarta banned the term *cultural prestige* coined by the Department of Culture to encourage pioneer villages of cultural villages. Nonetheless, DANAIS can still be attained. Moreover, please support activities involving the four pioneer pillars. Other Regional Apparatus Organizations have given signs to support this cultural prestige --a means of connecting our program with the Special Region of Yogyakarta- to actualize cultural-independent villages.” (The Department of Culture of Bantul Regency, 29 March 2022)

Hence, the management of cultural villages and cultural-independent villages that do not follow the provisions of the Department of Culture of the Special Region of Yogyakarta absolutely cannot be implemented. Likewise, at the village level, where cultural-independent village administrators also cannot be innovative except by following existing regulations and protocols.

#### **Cultural-Independent Villages and Poverty Alleviation**

The efforts and attention of the government of the Special Region of Yogyakarta towards maintaining and protecting local culture, especially in villages, actually appeared before the birth of the Law of Privileges of the Special Region of Yogyakarta in 2012. This was marked by the stipulation of the Decree of the Governor of the Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 325/KPTS/1995 concerning Guidelines for the Establishment of a Cultural-Development Village in the Province of the Special Region of Yogyakarta. Based on this decision, since 24 November 1995, a total of 32 villages have been designated cultural villages. After the Law on Privileges of the Special Region of Yogyakarta was enacted, the Regulation of the Governor of the Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 36 of 2014 concerning Cultural Villages was enacted. The Governor's Regulation is a guideline in determining cultural villages and developing, empowering, and preserving all cultural wealth owned by cultural villages. The existence of the cultural village continues to grow. Until 2016, it has increased to 56 cultural villages, based on the Decree of the Governor of the Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 262/KEP/2016 concerning the Establishment of Cultural Villages (Kedaulatan Rakyat, 6 April 2017). Based on the Decree of the Governor of the Special Region of Yogyakarta Number 351/KEP/2021, in 2021, there will be an additional 20 cultural villages, so there will be 76 cultural villages until 2021.

After the implementation of the Yogyakarta Special Region Regulation Number 11 of 2019, related to efforts to accelerate poverty reduction and income disparities between regions, Cultural-Independent Villages have been initiated for five villages as the highest classification/category of advanced classification cultural villages, which begins with the Preparation of Cultural-Independent Villages, also begins with the pioneer stage of the Cultural-Independent Village. The five villages are ready to become the driving force for developing all sectors (tourism, economy, women's empowerment, labor, maritime) based on culture. Next, in 2020, it will develop into 10 Cultural Independent Villages, and in 2021 it will increase again to 18 Cultural Independent Villages. Thus, until 2021, 76 cultural villages and cultural-independent villages have been formed, while the other 362 villages have not had the status of cultural villages.

In essence, the establishment of cultural-independent villages aims to achieve the welfare of rural communities and reduce poverty in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. It will revive the village economy by growing the four pillars of village economic life based on cultural villages, tourism villages, village-preneur, and prima (tough women's role) villages. The village's economic growth is expected to encourage an increase in residents' income so that they can achieve prosperity, as well as reduce and alleviate poverty in the Special Region of Yogyakarta. Over the last two years of practice, the results of the development of cultural-independent villages in 3the Special Region of Yogyakarta have not impacted poverty alleviation.



**Table 1.** Distribution of Poverty Rates in the Special Region of Yogyakarta  
 From 2017 to 2021, per City/Regency Area

City/Regency	2017 (%)	2018 (%)	2019 (%)	2020 (%)	2021 (%)
Yogyakarta	32.20	29.75	29.45	31.62	34.07
Sleman	96.75	92.04	90.17	99.78	108.93
Bantul	139.67	134.84	131.15	138.66	146.98
Kulon Progo	84.17	77.72	74.62	78.06	81.14
Gunungkidul	135.74	125.76	123.08	127.61	135.33
Total	488.53	460.11	448.47	457.73	506.45

Source: Regional Development Planning Agency of the Special Region of Yogyakarta. 2021. <https://bappeda.jogjaprov.go.id>. Accessed on 18 February 2022

The data above shows an increase in poverty, especially in 2020 and 2021, where Bantul Regency was the area with the highest poverty rate. The poverty rate that has increased in the last two years has negatively impacted the COVID-19 pandemic since 2019. Compared with the poverty rate of all provinces in Indonesia as of September 2021, the Special Region of Yogyakarta was ranked 10<sup>th</sup> with a poverty rate of 11.91%, more significant than the national poverty rate of 9.71% (<https://www.bps.go.id>, accessed on 18 February 2022). However, based on the Human Development Index (IPM), the Special Region of Yogyakarta was included in the high category, with an average of five regencies/cities tending to increase from year to year to 80.22 in 2021 (<http://bappeda.jogjaprov.go.id>, accessed on 18 March 2022).

Nevertheless, the poverty rate in the Special Region of Yogyakarta has begun to decline, as stated by the Head of the Central Statistics Agency for the Special Province of Yogyakarta, Mr. Sugeng Arianto, as follows:

- 1) In general, the poverty rate in the Special Region of Yogyakarta tended to decrease in numbers and percentages from September 2014 to September 2021. Increased prices of essential goods triggered the increase in poverty due to the increase in fuel prices in March 2015. Then there was an increase in poverty due to the COVID-19 outbreak from March 2020 to September 2021.
- 2) The percentage of urban poor in the Special Region of Yogyakarta in September 2021 was 11.20% or 331.71 thousand people, then decreased by 1.03% or 27 thousand people compared to March 2021. Meanwhile, the rural poor in September 2021 was 13.99% or 142.78 thousand people, then decreased by 0.45% or 5 thousand people compared to March 2021. In absolute terms, the number of poor people in the Special Region of Yogyakarta was primarily found in urban areas. The Poverty Line of the Special Region of Yogyakarta in September 2021 was recorded at IDR 96,904.00/capita/month with the Food Poverty Line (GKM) composition of Rp358,285 or 72.10%, and the Non-Food Poverty Line (GKBM) of Rp138,620 or 27.90%. The rate of increase in the poverty line in rural areas was higher than in urban areas. The increase in the rural Poverty Line was 5.84% higher than the 2.04% increase in the urban Poverty Line from March 2021 to September 2021.
- 3) Indonesia's average number of poor households had 4.15 household members as of September 2021. When viewed from a household perspective, the household poverty line reached Rp2,062,151,60/household/month. The problem of poverty is not just the number and percentage of poor people. However, it is also necessary to pay attention to the depth and severity of poverty (P1 Index). The P1 index for the Special Region of Yogyakarta decreased to 2.062 in September 2021, which provided a good signal for poverty alleviation programs because it illustrated that the average expenditure of the poor was starting to move closer to the poverty line (<https://www.krjogja.com>, accessed on 18 February 2022).

Regarding the high poverty rate on the one hand and HDI on the other hand, the Head of the Bank Indonesia Representative Office for the Special Region of Yogyakarta explained that the level of poverty in Indonesia is not determined by income but by people's expenditures. Meanwhile, the Special Region of Yogyakarta is said to have a relatively low level of expenditure caused by various things, such as the following statement: "Regarding the problem of spending by the people of Yogyakarta, whether in Sleman, Bantul, and Gunung Kidul regencies, anything is available, such as chilis and onions, so that is why the expenditure is small. Yogyakarta Statistics data shows that the number of poor people is 503,140, or 12.8% of the total population. It is recorded that the poor in the urban area of the Special Region of Yogyakarta increased by 5,500 people to 358,660 people; on the other hand, the poor in the Yogyakarta Special Region rural areas decreased by 2,100 people to 147,800 people for the same period. Based on the National Socio-Economic Survey calculation in March 2021, the Central Statistics Agency recorded the poverty line

in the Special Region of Yogyakarta at Rp482,855/capita/month, while the food poverty line was recorded at Rp350,0007/capita/month. Therefore, as long as the factor for calculating does not change, it will be difficult to reduce poverty in Yogyakarta." (<https://money.kompas.com>, accessed on 17 February 2022)

Based on the description above, it is known that the contribution of cultural-independent villages in reducing poverty in the Special Region of Yogyakarta is necessary. For this reason, it is necessary to optimize policies for handling poverty in rural areas to support efforts to accelerate poverty reduction, especially through policies on managing cultural and cultural-independent villages. Of the 76 cultural and 18 cultural-independent villages, further, development is needed for 392 villages that are still non-cultural. Therefore, it is indispensable to have a study and analysis of cultural and independent village management policies that have been carried out so far to evaluate their inputs, outputs, and outcomes for improving people's welfare, especially in the context of culture. It is possible that cultural-independent villages do not guarantee better welfare than other villages of lower status. This was conveyed by one of the Heads of the Culture Office of Gunungkidul Regency as follows:

“When visiting the location, judging from the potential and expression, they are brave if they are pitted against a cultural village. Even the current pocket position, when compared to the Cultural Village, is also bold. I once suggested that if there was a cultural village that was stagnant and immobile, it should have been degraded by the young and moving ones. Strong enough to be a cultural pioneer – culturally independent. This means that a certain status, such as a cultural-independent village, does not guarantee everything is going well.” (Head of the Department of Culture of Gunungkidul Regency, 29 March 2022)

Thus, the *cultural-independent village* status, which is the highest in the category of cultural village, does not automatically increase the welfare of the village community; in fact, there are villages whose status is below it, or even there is no status. However, the welfare of the citizens is high. Another thing to look at is the leader's willingness (in this case, the governor of the Special Region of Yogyakarta) to focus more on managing cultural and cultural-independent villages to improve the welfare of the people. In addition, it is also necessary to have clear and measurable indicators to determine the level of success of a cultural-independent village so that it can see the economic development of the village after it is established as a cultural-independent village. The Head of the Department of Culture stated the same thing as follows:

“Economic improvement must have the same size as the existence of a cultural-independent village. This is what we propose: We do not need to measure the personal impact of this program. It needs the same criteria and indicators to measure the program's impact. The program will improve the community's economy. In the past, this center, after being added to this center, the tourists became comfortable with parking. Sizes that are generally standardized do not seem to exist yet. This forum provides how to measure the same perception.” (Head of the Department of Culture of Bantul Regency, 29 March 2022).

Therefore, so far, there has been no clear and firm measure related to the village's economic development after it was established as a cultural-independent village. For this reason, it needs studies on the creation of benchmarks for the success of cultural-independent villages.

#### **A Concept of Developing a Cultural-Independent Village – According to Sri Sultan Hamengkubuwono X**

The Governor of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, Sri Sultan Hamengku Buwono X (HB X), believes that the success of a Cultural Independent Village (DMB) depends on the organization and human resources of the actors. The organization of this DMB concerns the governance and management of the Cultural Independent Village Institution. Even though the management of the DMB organization is outside the village government, the planned programs must be in synergy with the village government's development program so that they have the driving force and synergy in promoting the development program. Thus, financing is accelerating and strengthening so that the villagers can widely feel the results. For this reason, it is necessary to develop human resources (capacity building) and DBM management to align with the village apparatus's capacity. ([jogjaaja.com](http://jogjaaja.com), 29-11-2022)

Likewise, HB X also hopes for the emergence of embryos of ideas about the form of simplification of organizational structures and functional relationships across Regional Apparatus Organizations (OPD) because the DMB program involves 15 OPDs of the Special Region of Yogyakarta and Regency/City OPDs. On the one hand, the large number of OPDs involved in handling cultural-independent villages is encouraging for the village because many OPDs are concerned with handling the development of other DMBs. Problems arise related to coordination, division of tasks, and supervision that have not been integrated, causing overlap in programs and assistance for DMB programs and activities. Meanwhile, villages without status do not receive any assistance from privileges because they focus only on villages with cultural village status and DMB. The question is: What are the rights of villagers who live in villages that do not have categories? Of course, there is no privilege fund facilitation. That is why this has to be reorganized so that villagers get rights and justice from the DAN AIS assistance from the central government.

DMB itself is a form of Model Village that is managed in an integrated manner while still paying attention to the role of residents in its management. DMB is essential because it has various strategic roles, and can provide a



specific village identity. The impact of the determination of the Model Village motivates increased awareness and participation of residents in DMB. Thus, DMB is a typical village model of Yogyakarta whose management involves the province, regency/city, and village government and the village community's participation. In its development, several models emerged as the distinctive identity of village characteristics and the basis for assisting the Yogyakarta DANAI. For DMB status, for example, the Government of the Special Region of Yogyakarta provides DANAI assistance of 1 to 1.5 billion rupiahs to support four pillar programs, namely Cultural Village, Tourism Village, Village-Preneur, and Prima (women's role) Village. The impact of establishing DMB can motivate villagers to immediately achieve DMB status so that villages receive significant financial assistance.

Regarding the organization of DMB managers, HB X proposed simplifying the cross-structural and functional organization by forming a Semi Full-Time Task Force. Facts on the ground show that the large number of OPDs participating in the development and facilitation of DMB will result in high costs and less than optimal results because the costs will be absorbed more for operational costs than for community assistance. Another effect, the large number of OPD in the management of DMB often causes a commotion because there is an ego-sectoral nature between OPD. Under such conditions, forming a kind of semi-full-time Task Force is the best way to eliminate various problems of coordination, synchronization, development, and supervision of DMB by Provincial OPD and Regency/City OPD. This Task Force is led by the Regional Secretariat, accompanied by the Daily Chief of Paniradya Pati and the deputy, namely the Head of the Organizational Bureau, supported by HR Echelon 3 OPD officials who are competent in the field of the organization.

Regarding the strengthening of DBM, HB X conveyed several points of concern regarding the strengthening of DBM, namely the actual participation of citizens. Social approaches to develop village potential must be maximized but also vary according to the profile of each village. This is in line with the Javanese proverb, *desa mawa tata, negara mawa cara*, which means that villages have their own customs, and the state has its own laws. This expression is embodied in the Village Law No.6/2014, which gives the village authority in managing its own household without leaving the constitutional framework of the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia and the privileges of the Special Region of Yogyakarta. Thus, the involvement of villagers in implementing the DMB program must pay attention to the cultural diversity that exists in the village with (de facto) very high plurality. Thus, the OPD that accompanies DMB must always place the cultural context in the village in a condition of diversity. Village authority based on Law No. 6/2014 strongly supports DMB in developing a culture regarding village autonomy. Likewise, the moment of implementing cultural village-based privileges is also relevant to the context of village origin rights.

Furthermore, HB X launched the 'The Village Serves the City' strategy, where villages can become centers of economic growth to support urban food. For this reason, village development must be assisted and facilitated by the district; more than that, it must be prioritized because it is relevant to accelerate village development, where the potential source is in the village. In designing the DMB program, it must be adjusted to village development, especially the development of the agricultural sector which can support the city's food needs. Villages must grow in all areas with provincial and district facilitation.

Along with the times, global information technology has reached people's lives in villages. At this time, the development of DMB should be encouraged. Looking back at the background of the Special Region of Yogyakarta, a special region, there have been many teachings on leadership that can be used as a reference for action or steps. The concept of developing DMB must integrate various appropriate village technologies and the values of local wisdom, especially the cultural values inherited by the Kraton Ngayogyakarta Hadiningrat. The practice of local culture in village development is also not easy because the onslaught of technology that enters the village has influenced cultural practices and local wisdom in the village so that the village must re-knit the value of past local wisdom.

Another strategy in order to develop DMB is that the Sultan introduced the embodiment of the leadership *Manunggaling Kawulâ-Gusti* (MKG, which means a leader who is united with his people), which the OPD Heads imitated to the head of village and their apparatus, then passed it on to the people to achieve the objectives of DMB implementation jointly. In this concept, DMB is an object and a subject in various activities because activities in DMB are collaborations between actors, such as provincial and regency/city OPD, cultural village managers who incidentally are community leaders, village governments, and community members. Henceforth, this DMB activity is a meeting of actors or elites from the province, regency, district, and village. This is seen as MKG leadership style manifested in the development of DMB.

In the essence of the MKG leadership practice, the people's lives are united in the leadership system in DMB, which are components that need each other. The head of a village cannot rule without the people, and the people need the care and guidance of the head of the village. In essence, the existing actors must work together to form a single force so that all contribute to advancing DMB. Thus, the development of a cultural village should not be interpreted as *Dhawuh Dalem* (a kind of command that the sultan gave to his people) to the Head of the OPD as a servant. There

is often confusion about how this service is done; it can be used as an 'umbrella protection' for the inability or lack of innovation and the death of creativity to carry it out. Therefore, the meaning of the MKG leadership concept must be interpreted as joint work between the elite and the people so that there is synergy between the leader and the villagers. In this case, the leader must be able to care for each other towards his people, who are deficient in all respects. Leadership in DMB must be comprehensive that combines informal leadership in a cultural context and formal leadership in a modern leadership context. Thus, there is a process of cultural institutionalization or cultural bureaucratization.

HB X also believes that cultural values are not only meant to be taken literally but must be developed for their use-values for citizens. It is necessary to think about how to apply it contextually with today's media and all the dynamics of the challenges of the times. This means that culture is not only interpreted as something explicit but what is implied dynamically so that it does not lose its spirit. In this era of information and communication systems development, cultural development must be supported by technology. In the village, communication technology and social media must be developed as a tool to explore cultural values and develop new cultivation as a value driving citizen participation in all life. The application of ICT in the village is a necessity if the village wants to be developed as a center for cultural development within the framework of privilege.

The challenges for development in the era of technology and communication are pretty heavy for villages because they have to adapt to a strategic environment that has changed by technological disruption, the challenges of the industrial era 4.0, which led to the order of society 5.0, and during the lives of the majority of millennials with a vision and paradigm that is much different from our generation now. In other words, the development of DMB, which the younger generation should support in the village, on the other hand, there is a youth crisis in the village due to the pursuit of ambition and an urban lifestyle. The potential of utilizing youth who have the capacity in the village is a necessity and the biggest challenge to developing a complete village within the framework of a culturally independent village.

For this reason, HB X hopes that, with the formation of a Task Force which is somewhat free from bureaucratic administrative tasks and consists of competent officials, hopefully, it will soon be able to produce a simplification of the Organizational Structure along with a realistic DMB work program, and can be a marker of the privileges of the Special Region of Yogyakarta which deserves further development. The complexities of local government institutions that take part in managing DMB management generate more opportunist costs, considering that moving the bureaucracy requires high costs so that the absorption of costs is more remarkable for the process than for its purpose, namely accelerating the welfare of villagers. A concrete step forward is to evaluate the management of DMB, then de-bureaucratization and deregulation of DMB management will be carried out. The concept of an independent village, one of which is enlightened and village autonomy, implies that the village should not be heavily intervened by the OPD so that the village is busy serving the rules and policies of the OPD, instead of being busy building the village based on its own initiative.

An alternative that can be done is to involve universities and civil society groups to oversee DMB, which is not procedural and full of bureaucratization. The tasks of local governments through standard OPD are only to make policies, facilitate budgets, and conduct mentoring and evaluation. Many best practices have shown that villages are more comfortable accompanied and facilitated by third parties because they are free from bureaucratic and structural constraints that cause distance. In its management, networks must be developed between DMB and third parties such as universities, NGOs, and other civil society, as well as local government parties. Thus, a good governance model will be formed, as well as eliminating the domination of the government's role through OPD so that there is balance and control in the funding of culturally independent villages in the privilege fund scheme.

## 5. CONCLUSION

The summary from the above discussion is as follows:

1. The establishment of cultural-independent villages (DMB) is a series of the formation of cultural villages. To become a DMB, starting from a cultural village, then to a cultural-independent pioneer, then moving up to DMB class. Conceptually and normatively, DMB is a complete village model that has implemented four programs, namely cultural village, tourism village, village-preneur, and Prima (women's role) village. The implementation of these four pillars is expected to be able to revive the economy independently without intervention by the supra-village government, which in turn can increase residents' productivity so that they can be more prosperous. However, in carrying out its program, DMB is guided by four related Regional Apparatus Organizations (OPD) so that there is no independence. Even the Department of Culture of the Special Region of Yogyakarta has placed two facilitators who always accompany as well as local government representatives.
2. The development from a cultural village to becoming a DMB is a long process that can be seen as cultural bureaucratization because it includes a regulatory and institutional process by the OPD with norms, standards, and



work mechanisms, all of which are protocol-regulated by the local government, especially the Department of Culture. In financing, it is also assisted by the privilege fund (DANAIS) to make cultural villages and DMB depend on the government of the Special Region of Yogyakarta. In utilizing DANAIS, the Government of the Special Region of Yogyakarta also does not have a program based on a clear vision and mission in realizing people's welfare, so it seems that it is just spending the government budget.

3. The structural approach to managing DMB, which is directed at developing four pillars guided by four related OPDs, causes DMB only to develop four fields, namely cultural village, tourism village, village-preneur, and Prima village with a progressive role for women. The development of these four fields is expected to encourage village productivity towards prosperity so that it seems forced to develop the four fields. The village's potential is not only limited to four fields, but many other potentials such as agriculture, plantations, fisheries, and other service sectors that also need to be developed.

The goal of establishing DMB is to increase people's welfare or reduce poverty. The fact shows that its success has not been measured in reducing poverty. The Department of Culture of the Special Region of Yogyakarta has not conducted research related to the formation of DMB to reduce the village's poverty level. This happens because the existing budget does not focus on implementing various development programs but on financing the development process itself by the OPD and institutional assistance and other operational costs. For this reason, it is necessary to simplify the institutions that manage DMB, which focuses on strengthening villages and reducing the role of the government.

## REFERENCES

- [1] Endraswara, S. (2003). *Literary Research Methodology: (Epistemology, Models, Theories, and Applications)*. Yogyakarta: FBS Universitas Negeri.
- [2] Herdiansyah, H. (2010). *Qualitative Research Methods for Social Sciences*. Jakarta: Salemba Humanika.
- [3] Jacobs, Harvill, & Manson. (1994). *Dictionary of Behavioral Science*. California: Academic Press.
- [4] Koentjaraningrat. (1984). *Javanese Culture*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- [5] Lewis, M. (1983). Conservation: A Regional Point of View. In M. Bourke, M. Miles, & B. Saini, *Protecting the Past for the Future*. Canberra: Australian Government Publishing Service.
- [6] Mir'atun, A. N. (2018). Strategy to Accelerate Development of Independent Village, Study in Kemadang Village, Gunungkidul. *Jurnal Pemberdayaan Masyarakat: Meida Pemikiran dan Dakwah Pembangunan*, 177-198.
- [7] Ndraha, T. (1991). *Village Governance Dimensions*. Jakarta: PT Bumi Aksara.
- [8] Januarti, N. E., & Pinasti, V. I. (2017). Environment Development Strategy of Tourism Village in Sendangsari, Pajangan, Bantul, DIY. *Jurnal Sosiologi Reflektif*.
- [9] Rochayanti, C., & Triwardani, R. (2014). A Lesson from Yogyakarta: A Model of Cultural Preservation through Cultural Village. *Proceeding 1st International Graduate Research Conference*. Chiang Mai: Chiang Mai University.
- [10] Triwardani, R., & Rochayanti, C. (2014). Implementation of The Cultural Village Policy in Preserving Local Culture. *Jurnal Reformasi*.
- [11] Kartohadikoesoemo, S. (1984). *Village*. Jakarta: Balai Pustaka.
- [12] Pinasti, V. I. (2015). *Research Report: Tourism Village Development as The Implementation of the Village Constitution and the Privilege Constitution of DIY (Study in Sendangsari Village, Pajangan, Bantul)*. Yogyakarta.
- [13] Indonesian Government Constitution. (2012). Constitution No. 13 Year. 2012 concerning The Privilege of The Special Region of Yogyakarta. Jakarta, Indonesia.
- [14] Yogyakarta Provincial Government. (2017). Regional Regulation of The Special Region of Yogyakarta No. 3 Year. 2017 concerning Culture Preservation and Development. Yogyakarta, The Special Region of Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- [15] Yogyakarta Provincial Government. (2019). Regional Regulation of The Special Region of Yogyakarta No. 11 Year. 2019 concerning Poverty Alleviation. Yogyakarta, The Special Region of Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- [16] Yogyakarta Provincial Government. (2014). Governor Regulation of The Special Region of Yogyakarta No. 36 Year. 2014 concerning Cultural Village/Kelurahan Budaya. Yogyakarta, The Special Region of Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- [17] Yogyakarta Provincial Government. (2019). Governor Regulation of The Special Region of Yogyakarta No. 25 Year. 2019 concerning Institutional Guidelones for Privilege Affairs in Regency/City and Village Governments. Yogyakarta, The Special Region of Yogyakarta, Indonesia.

- 
- [18] Yogyakarta Provincial Government. (2021). Governor Regulation of The Special Region of Yogyakarta No. 30 Year. 2021 concerning Amendments Governor Regulation No. 25 Year. 2019 concerning Guidelines for Privilege Affairs in Regency/City and Village Governments. Yogyakarta, The Special Region of Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- [19] Yogyakarta Provincial Government. (1995). Governor Decree of The Special Region of Yogyakarta No. 325/KPTS/1995 concerning Guidelines for the Establishment of Cultural Development Village in The Special Region of Yogyakarta. Yogyakarta, The Special Region of Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- [20] Yogyakarta Provincial Government. (2016). Governor Decree of The Special Region of Yogyakarta No. 262/Kep/2016 concerning Designation of Cultural Village/Kelurahan. Yogyakarta, The Special Region of Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- [21] Yogyakarta Provincial Government. (2021). Governor Decree of The Special Region of Yogyakarta No. 351/KEP/2021 concerning Appointment of Cultural Village. Yogyakarta, The Special Region of Yogyakarta, Indonesia.
- [22] Yogyakarta Provincial Government. (2008). Academic Manuscript of Privilege Constitution of Yogyakarta, 2008 : 12. Yogyakarta, The Special Region of Yogyakarta, Indonesia.