

## Rusdiono

Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Tanjungpura, Indonesia.

## Adityo Darmawan Sudagung

Department of International Relations, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Universitas Tanjungpura, Indonesia. (email: adityo.ds@fisip.untan.ac.id)

Submitted: 22 December 2023, Revised: 9 February 2024, Accepted: 13 February 2024

**Rusdiono** is an esteemed Associate Professor at the Department of Public Administration at Universitas Tanjungpura, Indonesia. Born on March 17th, 1964, he earned his Bachelor's degree from Universitas Tanjungpura in 1987, and his Master's degree, with a specialization in Public Policy from Universitas Gadjah Mada in 2001. Later, Rusdiono completed his Ph.D. in 2014 at the Department of Public Administration in Universitas Padjadjaran, specializing in Public Policy. For more than three decades, Rusdiono has been serving as a lecturer at the prestigious Faculty of Social and Political Science at Universitas Tanjungpura. His research interests span Good Governance, Border Management, and Public Policy in West Kalimantan, Indonesia.

**Sudagung, Adityo Darmawan** earned his Bachelor's degree from the Department of International Relations at Universitas Padjadjaran, Indonesia, in 2013. He continued his academic journey at the same university for his master's degree at the Department of Political Science, specializing in International Relations from 2013-2015. In 2016, Sudagung became a lecturer at the Department of International Relations at Universitas Tanjungpura and was appointed as an assistant Professor in 2021. Currently, he is pursuing his Ph.D. in Development Studies at the University of Vienna, Austria, focusing on border studies, Southeast Asia studies, and belonging. In 2023, Sudagung was honored as the first winner of a writing contest held by Indonesia's National Agency of Border Management. His research interests revolve around International Relations from a people-centered perspective with a multidisciplinary approach.

Policy & Governance Review  
ISSN 2580-4820  
Vol. 8, Issue 1, pp. 58-74  
DOI: <https://doi.org/10.30589/pgr.v8i1.904>

## The Implementation of One Village One Product (OVOP) Program in Sambas Regency

### Abstract

This paper examines the local government's implementation of village development policy at the borderlands, aiming to address the research gap by explaining the implementation of public policy through a case study of the One Village One Product (OVOP) program in Sambas Regency, Indonesia, which shares a border with Sarawak, Malaysia. We provide academic contributions to the field of public policy at the intersection of village development and border studies by explaining the local experience of implementing public policy. Additionally, the study provides practical recommendations for stakeholders in both public and private sectors to enhance OVOP programs following the best practices learned from other countries. The study, conducted from August to October 2023, employed qualitative research methods through observation and 15 interviews with government officials, the regency and village levels, and the local figures. Relevant documents were also collected and analyzed. The study found that two models of policy implementation applied in the research setting. In most villages, the OVOP program implemented the dominant top-down models due to the independent work of regency government officials and inadequate collaboration. The bureaucracy only provides short-term assistance and empowerment while hindering the aspirations of the private and community sectors to participate. At the same time, a hybrid model is exercised in one village where local stakeholders, the village government, and private and community sectors collaborate based on their sense of belonging toward "home" with less intervention from the regency government. The study recommends enhancing regular on-site or online communication and active collaboration between all stakeholders in the regency and the village level to improve OVOP program implementation in Sambas Regency.

### Keywords:

borderlands; implementation of public policy; one village one policy; village development

## Introduction

The implementation of public policy became one of the main topics in public administration studies. The term has emerged since the 1970s up to now. The studies started to focus on the critics of a national policy of particular states, dominated by the decision makers' actions, which distorted the policy's expectation to action and failure in practice (Pülzl & Treib, 2007, p. 89). The focus point on the failure of implementation policy arose again in the 2000s, as O'Toole (2004) criticizes through the reflection of numerous works published on the same topic. His evaluation is that the theory of policy implementation most likely contradicts the practice and has disappointing results, although policymakers innovated according to the earliest critics since the 1970s (O'Toole, 2004, p. 309).

The next generations of the study emphasized theoretical approaches to policy implementation. The second generation introduced duality in researching the implementation of public policy by using top-down and bottom-up models (Pülzl & Treib, 2007, p. 89). The European scholars influenced the study's progress at this stage compared to the United States scholars. The third generation resembles the previous generation's focus on improving the last generation by combining such approaches and the operationalization of theory. Pülzl and Treib (2007, p. 89) described the latest as the most scientific than the others because they emphasized how to specify and test their hypothesis more accurately.

Hottenstein's work (2017) then summarized the implementation of public policy models from Pülzl and Treib (2007), which divided the process into three approaches: top-down, bottom-up, and hybrid. The top-down approach emphasizes the dominance of government in the policy-making process. The bottom-up approach opposes the first approach by prioritizing the local actors' initiative. The third approach was defined as a combination of both perspectives and highlighted

the importance of stakeholder collaboration. Hottenstein (2017) argues that Ripley's General Model, as one of the hybrid models of policy implementation, is applicable to analyze the policy implementation of human research subjects in higher education. These options gave scholars a broad alternative to researching policy implementation, especially when dealing with collaboration among actors.

In helping to explain the importance of collaboration in public policy implementation, we combine the collaborative approach of good governance. The good governance paradigm emphasizes balancing relations between government, the private sector/business world, and society from the early process into the evaluation process (Maksudi, 2017, pp. 336–337). Basuki (2018, p. 138) explained that government actors represented by bureaucratic behavior can be beneficial in driving meaningful change in the lives of markets and civil society. At the same time, Gannie-Rocchman in Widodo (2001, p. 107) urged the essential role of the private and community in a collective activity. We discovered that the concept of Public-Private Partnership, argued by Brinkerhoff and Brinkerhoff (2011), is probably the most widespread term to study the collaborations among actors in policy implementation and bridging the good governance concept. They specified the six characteristics of a good partnership, which are the common goals, a collaborative and consensus decision among parties, egalitarian structure and process, trust-based relations formally and informally, having synergic interactions, and performed shared accountability on the outcomes and results (Brinkerhoff & Brinkerhoff, 2011, p. 4).

As the study evolved, Saetren (2005) pointed out an interesting argument, saying that the topic is most likely death at the end of the 1980s but surprisingly regenerating itself from the 1990s until now. The practice of multidisciplinary research has put the non-core discipline, as

Saetren described the discipline outside political, public policy, and public administration study, using the implementation topic in their field, such as education, health, law, economics, and environment (Saetren, 2005, p. 564). Different contexts in every research setting during time influenced the study. In the 1990s, the study was influenced by the emerging idea of globalization, a more cooperative international relationship, and digitalization (Baofu, 2015; Li et al., 2022; Saetren, 2005). In the last five years, the uprising of right-wing extremism after the migration crisis in 2015, followed by the COVID-19 pandemic, made the study of public policy more diverse (Hagelund, 2020; Mylonas & Tudor, 2023; Whitsel et al., 2023).

Furthermore, territorial context became important. Every administration in a single country, from the macro to the micro level, might have a different approach to implementing their policy (Martínez-Córdoba et al., 2021). It influences how public administration scholars are also now broadening the topics and dealing in response to the Western-centric approach of implementing public policy study (Saetren, 2005, pp. 571–572). The three models of public policy implementation from Pülzl and Treib (2007) proved to pay less attention to what happens in the Global South because using the European Union as their case study. They even suggest further interpretive research of public policy implementation to overcome the influence of positivism in the study (Pülzl & Treib, 2007, p. 103). Thus, studying the implementation of public policy from the experience of the Global South or local context became more relevant.

Public policy implementation with the intersection of village development and border studies is relevant to this research because the study might expand the local aspects of public policy implementation with a specific case in village development at the border area. These areas tend to be perceived with a significant and

constantly changing movement of cross-border activity, presenting unique regional development problems. For example, the borders between Indonesia and Malaysia offer a compelling research opportunity due to the prevailing security concerns, including the illicit trafficking of drugs, human beings, and other commodities, as well as the perceived dangers to the national identities of both nations (Dewantara et al., 2023; Ishikawa, 2018; Jalli & Sualman, 2020; Karulus & Askandar, 2020; Rusdiono & Rochmawati, 2020; Sudagung & Rezasyah, 2020). Nevertheless, these regions also have a peculiarity in more fluid social relationships because it has similarities ranging from the use of the local language and identity of the family as well as emotional relationships as a large family (Awang et al., 2013; Efriani et al., 2020; Sudagung & Chalid, 2016).

Researching villages and borderlands is an innovative combination. Several studies have demonstrated that implementing effective governance practices in village public administration can effectively deter corruption and enhance the autonomy of village financial management (Putri et al., 2023; Susilowati et al., 2020). Other publications argue the importance of public involvement in organizing village governance (Handayani et al., 2023; Junaedi, 2023) and the efficacy of law enforcement (Ambarwati et al., 2019), as well as the collaboration and understanding between all relevant elements in the village (Pane, 2019). However, other research has shown that the implementation of good governance can also be abused and counterproductive in the case of China and Indonesia (Aminudin, 2019; Wang & Yuan, 2021). Meanwhile, research on the topic of villages in border studies more often focuses on humans or groups of local people as the primary unit of analysis (Wilson & Donnan, 2012) or the nationalism and security policy to harden the border, which positions the national government as the main actors (Jalli & Sualman, 2020; Karulus & Askandar, 2020;

Sudagung, 2021). In addition, most of the studies focused on the national policy which impacted the locals compared to the local government's policy (Azizurrahman, 2014; Bangun, 2014; Djuyandi et al., 2023; Madjid & Setiawan, 2021; Sudagung, 2021). Grindle (2007, p. 1) suggests the importance of local actors' involvement in the era of decentralization, which might influence the outcomes of good public administration delivered by the local people. At the same time, the citizens shifted their attention toward their local officials in asking for a better living environment than their national government (Grindle, 2007, p. 3). Thus, analyzing the village development policy from the local perspective at the borderlands is needed.

This study focuses on the case study of One Village One Product (OVOP) policy. While the idea of OVOP is not novel, the local government in Japan was the first to implement the policy. The policy became globally hyped since Japan introduced it in 1979 and successfully uplifted a poor hamlet in the Oita province. OVOP is essential to research because Japan's best practice influences other developing countries, such as Kyrgyzstan, Senegal, Malawi, Laos, Taiwan, Cambodia, and Thailand, to replicate or modify the policy to develop their poor areas (Mukai & Fujikura, 2015; Sega & Suzuki, 2019; Thi & Thu, 2013; Widiyanti, 2018). Kyrgyzstan, Thailand, and Senegal are examples of success in replicating the policy. Kyrgyzstan and Thailand accomplishments were even driven by the role of the Japan International Cooperation Agency (JICA), which took the initiative to build a good foundation and found common difficulties in developing countries to be human resource capacity issues, for example, education and local leadership (Japan International Cooperation Agency, 2023; Mukai & Fujikura, 2015). Meanwhile, Senegal successfully modified the OVOP approach by duplicating the Design Thinking (DT) approach that emphasizes continuous innovation and the importance of using information technology (Sega & Suzuki, 2019). In Indonesia, this concept has

also been implemented in several regions, such as Malang, Badung, Jepara, Purwarkarta, Bantul, Tabanan, West Lombok, Tasikmalaya, Kulonprogo, Pekalongan, Boyolali, Central Lombok, and Bangli which are supported through capacity development programs by the Ministry of Industry (Kumarananda et al., 2018; Manek, 2015; Miagina et al., 2021).

Several studies on OVOP have been conducted by researchers focusing on both benefits and challenges as well as comparisons with case studies at different locations. Mukai and Fujikura (2015) investigated OVOP regulations on a global scale, conducting comprehensive comparisons among various countries like Japan, Laos, Thailand, and Kyrgyzstan. More specific comparisons were made by Thi and Thu (2013), focusing on OVOP in Japan and One Tambon One Product (OTOP) in Thailand. A case study in Senegal is also one of the exciting studies because it combines policy approaches and Design Thinking (DT) (Sega & Suzuki, 2019). The application of OVOP in Indonesia has also been studied in several areas as case studies, such as in Northern Maluku, Sragen, and Badung (Miagina et al., 2021; Widiyanti, 2018). The key findings of previous research are agreement on three main formulas of Japanese OVOP principles, namely: (1) independence and creativity, (2) human resource development, and (3) local thinking but global action, the three of which are based on several government development policies covering the sectors of human resources capacity, production promotion, financial management, and marketing promotion (Sega & Suzuki, 2019). Nevertheless, all existing research is still focused on the benefits and challenges as well as the economic development, management, and marketing aspects of OVOP policies.

However, one of the other interesting findings is that differences in social, economic, and political conditions at the research site (either country or specific region in a country) provide

significant influence in the implementation of OVOP policies (Mukai & Fujikura, 2015; Segal & Suzuki, 2019; Thi & Thu, 2013; Widiyanti, 2018). For example, in Indonesia and Thailand, policy development patterns are still too much dominated by the government, even intervening in the corporate policies or credit schemes for entrepreneurs (Thi & Thu, 2013; Widiyanti, 2018). We found another case in eastern Indonesia where the policy has not been supported by public awareness concerning the village potencies (Miagina et al., 2021). This situation is different from Japan's success in Oita, which empowers the public and private sectors to develop superior economic products in the region, even if the early stages of the country are stimulating it (Thi & Thu, 2013; Widiyanti, 2018). They actively increased the government's institutional improvements at the local level (Manek, 2015). The first successful implementation in Japan is that they balance the institutional elements, private and public participation, and cross-sectoral collaboration.

While extensive studies have been conducted on village development and OVOP practices worldwide, we found a gap in the research on those topics in the border areas, which still needs to be improved. In this context, Sambas Regency has several researchable opportunities as one of the autonomous regions in the West Kalimantan Province located at the frontier of Indonesia with Malaysia. First, Indonesian border management policy has placed the border area as the front yard from the era of Susilo Bambang Yudhoyono to Joko Widodo (Sudagung & SD, 2020). The shifting policy has given Sambas Regency increasing attention from the central government, including the establishment of Aruk Village in Sajingan Besar District and Temajuk Village in Paloh District as a National Strategic Area that became one of the ten Economic Development Areas in Kalimantan, the setting up of the Aruk State Border Post, and the numerous visit of President Joko Widodo over the last ten years (Maulana et al., 2019;

Rusdiono & Rochmawati, 2020; Sudagung & SD, 2020). Secondly, Sambas Regency also has many outstanding commodities from the plantation, forestry, agriculture, maritime, fishing, and tourism sectors that can offer investors to advance regional development (PPID Kabupaten Sambas, n.d.; Sya'rawie, 2021). Thirdly, the leadership transition from Atbah Romin Suhaili to Satono in June 2021 also impacted the Government of Sambas Regency's excellence program by introducing the One Village One Product (OVOP) program, which synergizes with investment to capitalize on the districts of Sambas' significant potential and strategic position at the national level. This policy also aligns with Joko Widodo's strategy of prioritizing the development of rural areas (Setiawan, 2019).

Specifically for the case in the border area of Sambas Regency, we only found a previous study that once recommended the possibility of implementing OVOP. However, we assess their findings, which are still in question, by maximizing the role of Village Enterprise and business incubators in the village and having an economic sector approach focus (Pathuloh et al., 2019). Only since 2021 has the Government of the Sambas Regency implemented the OVOP policy as one of the Regent's leading programs.

Based on several research backgrounds we provided, the present study aims to analyze the research problem: how is the implementation of the One Village One Product (OVOP) program in the Regency of Sambas? The focus of unit analysis in the paper is the policy implementation from the perspective and experiences of officials and local people. Our study would contribute to filling the gap in existing research by using the theory of public policy implementation to examine the case study of OVOP programs conducted by the local government in the borderlands. From the present study, we provide academic contributions to the field of public policy at the intersection of village development and border studies by explaining

the local experience of implementing public policy. Additionally, the study provides practical recommendations for stakeholders in both public and private sectors to enhance the OVOP program in Sambas Regency following the best practices learned from other countries.

We provided the paper outline for the following sections for readability. The methods section will elaborate on our preference for the research method, consisting of the data collection and analysis process and a brief description of the research site. In the discussion segment, we argue the unsuccessful implementation of the OVOP program in the Sambas Regency due to four reasons: the Regional Apparatus Organizations (in Bahasa Indonesia, we call it *Organisasi Perangkat Daerah/OPD*) operate independently to implement the excellence program. Secondly, the public bureaucracy continues to dominate the public service related to the OVOP. Thirdly, there needs to be more space for private participation and public involvement in executing the excellence program. Finally, the collaboration between the government, private sector, and society must be improved. We subsumed the four reasons into two sub-points of the result and discussion part: the more dominant role of regency bureaucrats and the participation of policy stakeholders at the village level.

## Methods

The research was carried out using a descriptive qualitative approach. According to Suryabrata (2012, p. 75), this approach aims to create systematic, factual, and accurate information about the facts and characteristics of a particular population or area. We conducted qualitative research by describing the situation or process studied in the case of the OVOP policy in Sambas Regency (Suryabrata, 2012, p. 24). We want to know the main problems in regional apparatus organizations in implementing the excellent OVOP program and alternative problem

solutions from the public policy implementation theory.

Our research site was in Sambas Regency, which has a strategic location at the border of Indonesia and Malaysia, a high population and agricultural production in West Kalimantan Province, and some potential tourism areas. The regency has an area of 639,570 hectares (Sya'rawie, 2021). This area has 19 districts and 193 villages (Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Sambas, 2023). From 193 villages in 19 districts, the borderlands area is located in seven villages in two districts: Sajingan Besar and Paloh Districts. The border with Malaysia is highly influential for the development of Sambas Regency. Both districts have attracted the central government of Indonesia to declare them as the priority location for border area development and simultaneously built one national border post in Aruk (Rusdiono & Rochmawati, 2020; Sudagung & SD, 2020). Sambas population is the second largest in West Kalimantan, with a total population of 647,800 (Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Sambas, 2023; Sya'rawie, 2021). Sambas Regency has many superior commodities from the plantation, forestry, and agricultural sectors (PPID Kabupaten Sambas, n.d.). For example, Siamese orange production in Sambas produces an average of 1.2 million tons per year (Nirwahyudi, 2021). It is also supported by banana, rambutan, and durian commodities. Sambas Regency also has livestock commodities ranging from pigs, cows, buffalo, goats, ducks, and chickens (Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Sambas, 2023). Likewise, for the marine and fisheries sector, the geographical conditions of Sambas Regency, with a coastline of 198,76 km, allow for the possible development of fisheries and the carrying capacity of several districts for the development of aquaculture (cage and pond cultivation) with fish yields of approximately above 20.000 tons (Nirwahyudi, 2021). Apart from the potential of regional natural resources, Sambas Regency also has potential in

the tourism sector, especially natural tourism, marine tourism, agro-tourism, cultural tourism, historical tourism, and special interest tourism. There are at least 71 tourist attractions in Sambas Regency, one of which is well known to tourists from outside the region and abroad, the Temajuk tourist attraction (PPID Kabupaten Sambas, n.d.). Sambas Regency also has the potential for creative economic products, such as Sambas weaving, rattan & bamboo woven crafts, the Siamese orange processing industry, and the fisheries product processing industry (PPID Kabupaten Sambas, n.d.).

The data-collection process was conducted through interviews, observations, and documentary research from August to October 2023. The primary data was gathered from 15 semi-structured interviews using the guidelines we had previously compiled. The informants in Table 1 were purposefully picked to ensure that their roles in government and society were appropriate. The primary data is focused on the knowledge from our informant's experiences and the practices we observed during our field research. We followed the method of the expert interview from Rosenthal (2018). She suggested unfolding the experience of the expert involved as an actor in the object we are studying and making them feel invited to talk about their experience with the topic (Rosenthal, 2018, p. 133). Regarding ethical considerations, we anonymize the names of our informants and the village. In addition to the interviews, we observed the conditions of some villages and the facilities as well as the activities of the regency to village officials and the local people as our primary data. Furthermore, we gathered secondary data from other sources, such as books, academic articles, online media, and government documents, to corroborate the findings obtained through field research. The secondary data supported the empirical data from the interviews and observation phase.

**Table 1.**  
**Informants List**

<b>Name</b>	<b>Role/Position</b>
A1	Secretary of BAPPEDA Sambas Regency
A2	Head of Human Resources Division Sambas Regency
A3	Secretary of Tourism Offices Sambas Regency
A4	Chief of Village B1
A5	Chief of Village B2
A6	Chief of Village B3
A7	Chief of Dusun C1
A8	Head of Village Empowerment Organization at Village B1
A9	Head of Village Empowerment Organization at Village B4
A10	Secretary of Village B1
A11	Chief of Village B4
A12	Local Figure
A13	Local Figure
A14	Local Figure
A15	Local Figure

*Source: Authors, 2023*

To ensure that the data obtained was tested correctly, we carried out two triangulation techniques: technique and source triangulation. We compared the primary data gathered from each interview to reach data saturation regarding the topics in the OVOP policy implementation. The data analysis process is carried out from the time the data collection process begins with the mechanism for presenting data, verifying data, interpreting data, and drawing conclusions. Data analysis and interpretation are carried out simultaneously while data collection in the field takes place. After obtaining the information, analysis is carried out, and the following information is collected. Furthermore, activities in data analysis include searching for data, organizing it, looking for patterns, finding what is essential and what is learned, and deciding what to do. We then manually started to inductively create groups of topics or themes to structure the paper outline. The analysis phase allowed us to explain in more detail the process of OVOP implementation in Sambas Regency by articulating it from the public policy implementation approach and examining several evaluations on that topic.

## Results and Discussion

### The More Dominant Role of Regency Bureaucrats

The initiation of the OVOP program was carried out according to the top-down models. The elected regency leaders issued the program as part of their nine priority programs. Legal products support its implementation at the local level, namely Regional Regulation Number 9 of 2021 concerning the 2021-2026 Sambas Regency *Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah* (RPJMD), which accommodates the achievement of missions related to increasing regional economic independence through developing local superior potential and investment, increasing community income through job creation and expanding employment opportunities, and managing and utilizing natural resource potential with the principles of sustainable and environmentally sound development.

Bureaucracy plays a significant role in the initial stages of policy-making regarding public services to improve the welfare and prosperity of the people. Hottenstein (2017) mentioned that a top-down approach situated the government as the leading sector of policy implementation. However, in principle, the OVOP Development Program is expected to synergize with increasing investment. A1 explained to us that the OVOP development strategy included seven points, which are developing regional superior commodities, intensive coaching and assistance in villages that have economic activities as one of the regional leading products, provision of adequate basic infrastructure, involvement and active participation of all business actors, local government, academics, and the community, support the acceleration of independent villages, organize the distribution of goods and structuring regional culture to support the creative economy. The mentioned points showed that the initial idea of the policy implementation is applying the hybrid approach.

Our findings showed that the excellence programs launched by the Regent have not run optimally, especially in improving the community's welfare, and have not significantly influenced regional development. Statistical data related to poverty rates, open unemployment, economic growth, and the average length of schooling in Sambas Regency have yet to experience significant developments. In 2022, the poverty rate in the area will be 6.92%, which is higher than the average for West Kalimantan Province (Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Sambas, 2023). Likewise, the open unemployment rate has increased by 1.11% since 2021 (Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Sambas, 2023). This correlates with an economic growth rate of 4.64% and is supported by an average length of schooling of 6.74%, the second lowest in West Kalimantan (Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Sambas, 2023). The results of our interviews with A1, A2, and A3 also showed that one of the obstacles is the need for more synergy between OPD to encourage the achievement of these goals.

A12 also criticized because he felt the OVOP program was just a realization of campaign promises from elected political officials and was just campaign material ahead of the simultaneous regional elections in 2024. A13 also agreed by arguing that the program has yet to be implemented optimally by involving other private and community sectors. One of the reasons is that facilities and infrastructure programs, such as assistance programs, mentoring programs, and empowerment programs, are the implementation of the OVOP program carried out by OPD, which are more project-based or short-term.

We found out that the implementation of the OVOP program is oriented toward physical development in the form of building construction and provision and providing assistance, such as the tent and cart program, providing fertilizer, seeds, and so on. The other empirical fact is that the assistance supplied appears to be project-

oriented, as the program stopped after it was received by the community, without any more support in the future stages. A15 mentioned:

“The community hopes for technical assistance from PPL in implementing the program so that the community can learn how to plant seeds, plant seeds, fertilize, and harvest so that the assistance program can increase the community’s agricultural production.”  
– interview with A15 in August 2023

However, in reality, people’s expectations still need to be met. A8, A9, A11, and A4 agreed that implementing the assistance program in Villages B1 and B4 needed to be running better. We also got another statement that supported their argument.

“The seeds provided were not planted, and the fertilizer assistance was diverted to other crops, and some were even sold to other farmers who needed them. Our village has the potential to produce good quality black and red rice products in Sambas Regency, which nine farmer groups manage.”  
– interview with A10 in September 2023.

A8 added that marketing and product packaging hampered farmers’ black and red rice production. A4 also explained that they also needed more agricultural instructors and subsidized fertilizers needed by farmer groups. Unsustainable assistance in Village B1 was also felt in Village B4. A10 stated that even though they had also followed up on the OPD’s request by mapping the village’s potential, the mapping results had also been submitted by the village to the district.

Nevertheless, from 2022 until our research ended in October 2023, there has yet to be a follow-up from the OPD regarding the village potential mapping results that have been sent. Apart from that, the OVOP development program in the community empowerment sector carried out by

the Social and Community Empowerment Service focuses more on strengthening Village Enterprise. The OPD’s competent and experienced human resources do not support this Village Enterprise enhancing activity. Because the main tasks of OPD do not directly connect with the problems of MSMEs and Cooperatives, this influences efforts to advance the Village Enterprise. Not only that, but the Sambas Regency Government also focuses on achieving independent village status to measure OVOP’s success. According to C1’s statement:

“OPD is only oriented toward achieving the number or quantity of independent villages, but does not pursue the quality of independent village status, meaning that achieving independent village status does not necessarily reflect the quality of the village itself.” – interview with C1 in September 2023.

This opinion was confirmed by A5 and A6, who had been pursuing the target of improving the status of their village to become independent. The target of the provincial government also caused this since the Sutarmidji era, which has focused so much on increasing the status of independent villages throughout West Kalimantan. Yet, the orientation on numbers does not improve quality in realizing OVOP itself. On the other hand, village quality measures will provide more meaning, especially in mapping village potential and strengthening it to be developed in OVOP development.

The practices carried out by the OPD of the Sambas Regency Government in developing OVOP have not been developed jointly with the other sectors such as the private and community. According to our interview, the local people in the villages are concerned with this type of policy which only places the community as the object of the program development. A14 stated that this indeed could not be separated from the OPD perspective that the development of OVOP’s flagship program is only limited to providing

physical and non-physical program assistance as part of the issue of community empowerment alone. In practice, the policy only maintained the hierarchy of powers from the government to the community. They did not open any channel for more involvement from below, which is important in the spirit of collaborative good governance.

The practices supported by the findings from Thi and Thu (2013) as well as Widiyanti (2018) indicated that in some developing countries, the tendency of government sectors to take the lead and even dominate most of the OVOP program schemes is higher. Meanwhile, as suggested by Cagin in Syakrani and Syahriani, p. (2009, p. 121), hearing the citizens' voices while organizing power, and making decisions are also important. We argue that this situation gives rise to an attitude of domination by the government sectors over others, which will hamper the establishment of good coordination and communication between stakeholders. This hinders the implementation of the hybrid approach as their spirit in the first place by issuing the policy. The regency government tends to use the top-down model of public policy implementation, which Pülzl & Treib (2007) stated identified the dominance of government action compared to accommodating private or society in the bottom-up or hybrid model.

The OVOP development activities by OPD in Sambas Regency have yet to demonstrate collaboration and synergy with the community and the private sector. At least two points of a good partnership mentioned by Brinkerhoff & Brinkerhoff (2011) proved essential in this process. According to Gannie-Rocchman in Widodo (2001, p. 107), the involvement of private and community roles in collective action is lacking in this process. The local government of Sambas Regency should have paid more attention to these joint activities.

In addition, the local government defined investment as a self-act of policy implementation without considering the private sector. They

interpreted the term "investment" to mean making various development programs physical assistance to empower the community. The results of our interviews with OPD representatives show the impression that the term "investment" written in the document is, in practice, interpreted. The inaccurate interpretation of OVOP's superior program documents and continued misunderstanding of the program impacted the preparation of programs more oriented toward developing infrastructure and facilities and project-oriented programs on empowerment activities. The action led to the more dominant government action and blocked the investment from private sectors in the process.

The dominant involvement of the district government should be minimized by providing a balanced place or role for other elements, namely community and private sectors. In fact, behind the OVOP program, the most important essence is to involve the community and private sectors in joint decision-making, managing and optimizing the potential of a village. Ideally, the OVOP program by OPD is to produce one local superior product in one village in synergy with the entry of investors from the private sector or the community. Or, as happened in several OVOP success stories in Japan, Kyrgyzstan, and Thailand, where the community had independence in developing economic products unique to their region even after the training provider, whether the government or donors, had left their region (Mukai & Fujikura, 2015). The lack of participation and initiative from village managers and the community is also apparent in the case of Village B6, which is known as a Religious Village because it has cultural tourism potential in the form of the Sambas Palace Mosque. This potential can certainly attract personal and annual tourists, especially tourists from Sarawak, Malaysia, who still have historical ties, for example, by retracing the kingdom or making friends. However, A1 mentioned:

“It is regrettable that the potential possessed by Village B6 has not been exploited optimally by the village government.” – interview with A1 in September 2023.

This condition shows that OPD actors and village actors have yet to carry out their respective roles to synergise optimally with each other in developing the potential of religious tourism. Ideally, the two government-level actors should play roles and collaborate, not shift responsibility to each other. Government collaboration is going well, especially as we hope for synergy with the private sector and the general public. This also cannot be separated from the leadership in the OPD. Several local figures we interviewed indicated that the placement of structural employees needed to match their competencies. We argue that an organizational pattern like this can influence work relationships, leadership effectiveness, and organizational optimization in program preparation. Apart from that, we believe that the wrong recruitment process is also one of the causes of bad governance and an obstacle to creating effective, efficient, and accountable public services.

Other obstacles that occur in Village B6, according to A3, are the characteristics of the village's potential and difficulties in collaborating with heritage gatekeepers at religious tourism sites. Negotiations need to be carried out by the government so that the community feels they receive the same appreciation and opportunity to participate in developing the village and district. The lack of media to communicate and collaborate has hampered the degree of participation and understanding, which is essential in practicing the collaborative aspects of good governance, according to Pane (2019).

### **Participation of Policy Stakeholders at the Village Level**

Contrary to our first finding, we also found a successful hybrid approach to OVOP program

implementation. The practice is a collaboration pattern between the village government, private sector, and local communities in Village B7, South Jawa District. According to A3, the local stakeholders maximized the potential of the clean beach covered with coconut trees by providing various tourism facilities and infrastructure to enhance marine tourism. This was acknowledged by A8 and A9, who also stated that Village B7 often holds tourist attractions on the beach, such as cultural events, sports, modern and traditional music, celebrations of religious holidays, and celebrations of national and other holidays, which are managed jointly by the village government, community, and local private sector in that place. Their success brought national or local tourists from various surrounding areas to enjoy the beauty of the beaches and events at B7 Tourism Village. A3 mentioned:

“Approximately 100,000 visitors throughout the year impact driving the economy of the local village community and the PAD of Village B7. They have also received tourism village awards at the village level in Sambas Regency and village level in West Kalimantan Province. They will continue as representatives from West Kalimantan to compete between Kalimantan regions in 2023. Furthermore, if they win, they will represent Sambas villages in the Kalimantan region in 2023 to compete at the national level, the 2023 Indonesian Tourism Village award.” – interview with A3 in October 2023.

The collaborative action carried out by the three pillars in Village B7 shows that in implementing a combination of the hybrid approach policy and the good partnership which are oriented toward consensus decision-making as well as synergy in interactions and relations (Brinkerhoff & Brinkerhoff, 2011; Pülzl & Treib, 2007), can be implemented. Our finding showed that citizen power has been built by making

joint decisions and agreements in exploring and exploiting the village's potential to become a superior village product. One of the advantages of Village B7 was that there is no domination by specific stakeholders because hierarchical boundaries do not hinder every actor who dialogues, and there is mutual respect. We got this story from the stories of several village heads we interviewed based on their experience of visiting and having a dialogue with the B7 village head. We could not visit the B7 Village area during the research period due to transportation access and cost constraints.

One of the critical indicators of success in Village B7 is that the three main actors in the village setting emphasize the importance of equality and maintaining an equal position in relationships. Another supporting factor is the population composition, which is still the village people themselves or native residents. This impacts the togetherness of all pillars to advance this village together based on emotional closeness to their home, including persuasive efforts from the village government, which can convince the community of the projected success or benefits of developing sustainable tourism in their village.

The case in B7 provides a new insight into the study of village policy implementation. The practice focused on governance at the village level, which led to action or simultaneous collaboration in the form of a public-private partnership by Brinkerhoff and Brinkerhoff (2011). The previous theoretical approaches should have given more attention to social cohesion in the local setting. We would resonate their practices with the concept of socio-territorial belongings, highlighting the degree of loyalty to the place attached to the people (Pollini, 2005). From our study, we determined a significant approach to studying public policy implementation by incorporating cultural values stipulated from the daily practices of a given population in a particular place they called home. Their sense of belonging to their home drives the people in our research site

to move beyond what the government could do by only introducing the OVOP policy with less concrete action. Their love and loyalty to the village gave them extra motivation to make it a better place to live for the next generation.

Several other villages in the Sambas district are trying to enhance the village's potential to produce superior products, as successfully conducted in Village B7. A6 mentioned:

“The village government has innovated the village budget allocation to improve and improve product quality by allocating a budget to strengthen the implementation of OVOP at B3 Village with a budget allocation of Rp. 126.000.000 for the purchase of production machines, budget allocation of Rp. 65.000.000 for program development, the budget allocation of Rp. 15.000.000 for product promotion and budget allocation to facilitate aid funds for product supply gardens. The various programs are aimed at maintaining the potential of plantations, namely cassava, *peringgi*, and taro, which have been developed by the community and processed into typical B3 food product commodities in the form of chips from cassava, *peringgi*, and taro.” – interview with A6 in October 2023.

These efforts showed that the village government and its support and mutual agreement with the village community have adapted the program to develop the OVOP program into village programs that suit the village's needs. They have integrated OVOP's flagship program into village program plans through innovation or breakthroughs in village budget allocations. Apart from that, the village government has been able to carry out its role as an actor in making policies or programs sourced from village funds and allocation of village funds through the Musrenbangdes mechanism to optimize the utilization of village potential in supporting the acceleration of OVOP.

However, the village government's enthusiasm for supporting the development of the OVOP program has yet to be matched by the relevant OPD at the regency level. Of course, a situation like this must be responded to quickly by the regency government so as not to make the community less enthusiastic about developing the potential of their village for developing the OVOP program. Optimizing the role of OPD to coordinate and communicate with the village government is also needed. The implementation of OVOP can be maximized if the Sambas Regency Government can implement the hybrid public policy approach by increasing collaboration between government, private, and community elements.

Although we cannot deny that the government has an essential role in providing stimulus to society, as happened in Japan and Thailand (Thi & Thu, 2013), it is necessary to pay attention to the long-term sustainability of the scheme. Of course, lessons need to be learned from experiences in other countries that cannot ensure the sustainability of post-mentoring programs from the government or external parties (Mukai & Fujikura, 2015).

Thus, we propose the triple-helix model under the public-private partnership scheme to improve the implementation of OVOP while valuing the sense of belonging in the local people's homes. The aim is to build public participation, expand the role of each actor, and reduce OPD sectoral egos and unsustainable public policy management mindsets. Along with the complexity and variety of problems in developing the Sambas Regency OVOP program, this needs to be more consistent in its form and planning. This is partly due to the obstruction of private and public voices in articulating their interests in implementing the development of the OVOP program. We found the pattern of policy implementation needs to be more bottom-up or even hybrid by providing room for higher community participation. The valuation of the village as their "home" proved to be a solid

motivation for positive participation among the local people. By adding this value into a practice of policy implementation, we argue that it might benefit the village's development.

## **Conclusion**

We found two models of OVOP's policy implementation practices in Sambas Regency. The top-down model became the most applied approach to the program due to the short-term assistance and empowerment provided by the regency apparatus. In most villages, the policy did not optimally involve the private and community sectors. However, in the first place, the regency government wished to practice the hybrid policy implementation approach. The impact of an unbalanced relationship pattern was that the private and community sector voices were blocked from articulating their roles in the decision-making process even though the village government and the community have adapted the village program to align with the OVOP program. At the same time, a hybrid model practice is also applied in one of the villages, with an additional valuation of their sense of belonging toward their home. This feeling has become an extra motivation for the local people, including the village government, and private and local community, to implement the policy better. The local actors in the village collaborate within themselves with less involvement of the regency government. This best practice brings hope to improve the OVOP program in Sambas Regency by involving the local actors in the village with a hybrid approach to policy implementation.

We suggest that in the future, the OVOP program in Sambas Regency can be further enhanced by providing open space for the community to channel their aspirations, follow up with adaptive programs, and implement them consistently. This practical implication is needed so the bureaucracy realizes the importance of

the other parties in the policy implementation, as has already been successfully done in Japan and Thailand (Thi & Thu, 2013; Widiyanti, 2018). Furthermore, the local government needs to do more collaborations through the triple-helix model with an addition valuing the sense of belonging toward “home” and asking for regular meetings and coordination, for example, by using WhatsApp group communication and Zoom meetings besides on-site meetings, with the local people, village officials, and private sectors to check the progress and ask for their evaluation of each development potential in every village. The end goal of the suggested policy action is to empower every stakeholder's role concerning the OVOP implementation in Sambas Regency.

We reflected that the study has some limitations in generalizing the outcomes of the research while we only managed to interview 15 interlocutors from four villages. Nevertheless, due to our chosen qualitative method, which focused on developing the narratives from our interlocutors in addition to our observation and secondary data collected from the documents, we urged the next researchers to do quantitative research to measure the perception of the people on the implementation of OVOP policy in their village. However, we acknowledge the present study is only designed to focus on evaluating the policy's implementation, so we could not cover more complex dimensions within the practices. Thus, our suggestion for more options for future research is the possibility of studying the policy-making process of OVOP within the local government or focusing on the leader at Sambas Regency who initiated the policy first-hand. In addition, the research on the reason for bureaucracy dominance in the policy's implementation, as we found significant in this study, is also interesting to further elaborate and possibly relate to the topic of work culture and organizational behavior in public policy.

## References

- Ambarwati, R., Mudjib, A. W., Lestariana, F. F., & Handiwibowo, G. A. (2019). The Implications of Good Governance of Village Government Office in Sidoarjo. *Binus Business Review*, *10*(3), 147–158. <https://doi.org/10.21512/bbr.v10i3.5683>
- Aminudin, A. (2019). Implementation of Good Village Governance in Village Development. *JPALG*, *3*(1), 1–17. <http://jurnal.untidar.ac.id/index.php/publicadmini>
- Awang, A. H., Sulehan, J., Abu Bakar, N. R., Abdullah, M. Y., & Liu, O. P. (2013). Informal cross-border trade Sarawak (Malaysia)-Kalimantan (Indonesia): A catalyst for border community's development. *Asian Social Science*, *9*(4), 167–173. <https://doi.org/10.5539/ass.v9n4p167>
- Azizurrahman, S. H. (2014). Pembaharuan kebijakan pidana kejahatan perdagangan orang (Studi di wilayah perbatasan Kalimantan Barat-Sarawak). *Yustitia*, *3*(2), 88–99.
- Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Sambas. (2023). *Kabupaten Sambas Dalam Angka 2023*. Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Sambas.
- Bangun, B. H. (2014). Membangun model kerjasama pengelolaan perbatasan negara di Kalimantan Barat-Sarawak (Suatu Studi Perbandingan). *Masalah-Masalah Hukum*, *43*(1), 31–39.
- Baofu, P. (2015). The Future of Post-Human Public Administration: Towards a New Theory of Policy and Implementation Volume II. In *The Future of Post-Human Public Administration: Towards a New Theory of Policy and Implementation Volume II*. Nova Science Pub Inc. <https://www.ebsco.com/terms-of-use>
- Basuki, J. (2018). *Administrasi Publik, Telaah Teoritis dan Empiris*. Radjawali Press.
- Brinkerhoff, D. W., & Brinkerhoff, J. M. (2011). Public-private partnerships: Perspectives on purposes, publicness, and good governance.

- Public Administration and Development*, 31(1), 2–14. <https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.584>
- Dewantara, J. A., Sulistyarini, Prasetyo, W. H., Efriani, Riyanti, D., Afandi, & Ulfah, M. (2023). School teachers, national identity and an Indonesian-Malaysian border community: A case study in Entikong. *Issues in Educational Research*, 33(2), 510–528.
- Djuyandi, Y., Husin, L. H., Mustofa, M. U., & Iriansyah, M. N. (2023). Penguatan masyarakat di wilayah perbatasan sebagai bentuk pertahanan negara: Pengalaman dari Kecamatan Entikong, Kalimantan Barat. *Dharmakarya: Jurnal Aplikasi Ipteks Untuk Masyarakat*, 12(1), 89–97.
- Efriani, E., Hasanah, H., & Bayuardi, G. (2020). Kinship of bidayuh dayak ethnic at the border of Entikong-Indonesia and Tebedu-Malaysia. *ETNOSIA : Jurnal Etnografi Indonesia*, 5(1), 136. <https://doi.org/10.31947/etnosia.v5i1.8300>
- Grindle, M. S. (2007). *Going Local: Decentralization, Democratization, And The Promise Of Good Governance*. Princeton University Press.
- Hagelund, A. (2020). After the refugee crisis: public discourse and policy change in Denmark, Norway and Sweden. *Comparative Migration Studies*, 8(1). <https://doi.org/10.1186/s40878-019-0169-8>
- Handayani, E., Garad, A., Suyadi, A., & Tubastuvi, N. (2023). Increasing the performance of village services with good governance and participation. *World Development Sustainability*, 3, 1–8. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wds.2023.100089>
- Hottenstein, K. N. (2017). Protecting the Teaching and Learning Environment: A Hybrid Model for Human Subject Research Public Policy Implementation. *The Journal of Research Administration*, 48(2), 26–36.
- Ishikawa, N. (2018). Genesis of state space Frontier commodification in Malaysian Borneo. In A. Horstmann, M. Saxer, & A. Rippa (Eds.), *Routledge Handbook of Asian Borderlands* (pp. 168–179). Routledge.
- Jalli, N., & Sualman, I. (2020). Exploring contemporary security issues near sarawak-kalimantan border. *Jurnal Komunikasi: Malaysian Journal of Communication*, 36(1), 401–418. <https://doi.org/10.17576/JKMJC-2020-3601-23>
- Japan International Cooperation Agency. (2023, February 24). *Becoming a National Project from Scratch: Kyrgyzstan's One Village One Product Project Contributes to Revitalization and Empowerment News*. Japan International Cooperation Agency. [https://www.jica.go.jp/Resource/english/news/field/2022/20230224\\_11.html](https://www.jica.go.jp/Resource/english/news/field/2022/20230224_11.html)
- Junaedi. (2023). Implementation of village governance based on principles of good governance of public service in Indonesia. *International Journal of Business, Law, and Education*, 4(1), 249–266.
- Karulus, Y., & Askandar, K. (2020). Human Security and Development at the Border: the Case of Ba'kelalan, Sarawak, Malaysia. *East Asia*, 37(4), 369–380. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12140-020-09343-w>
- Kumarananda, I. G. V., Sutjipta, N., & Anggreni, I. G. A. A. L. (2018). Keberlanjutan Program One Village One Product melalui Manajemen Koperasi Tani Mertanadi di Desa Pelaga, Kecamatan Petang, Kabupaten Badung. *E-Jurnal Agribisnis Dan Agrowisata*, 7(4), 592–601.
- Li, V. Q. T., Ma, L., & Wu, X. (2022). COVID-19, policy change, and post-pandemic data governance: a case analysis of contact tracing applications in East Asia. *Policy and Society*, 41(1), 129–142. <https://doi.org/10.1093/polsoc/puab019>
- Madjid, U., & Setiawan, I. (2021). Tata Kelola Pemerintahan Dalam Mengatasi Masalah Sosial Pada Perbatasan Negara di Kecamatan Entikong Kabupaten Sanggau Provinsi Kalimantan Barat. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*

- Suara Khatulistiwa*, 6(1), 21–34. <https://doi.org/10.33701/jipsk.v6i1.1719>
- Maksudi, B. I. (2017). *Dasar-Dasar Administrasi Publik Dari Klasik ke Kontemporer*. Radjawali Press.
- Manek, Y. M. I. (2015). *Pendekatan One Village One Product (OVOP) Untuk Mengembangkan Produk Unggulan Di Sentra Home Industri Desa Dali Dan Desa Toyomarto*. Institut Teknologi Nasional Malang.
- Martínez-Córdoba, P. J., Benito, B., & García-Sánchez, I. M. (2021). Efficiency in the governance of the Covid-19 pandemic: political and territorial factors. In *Globalization and Health* (Vol. 17, Issue 1). BioMed Central Ltd. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12992-021-00759-4>
- Maulana, M. I., Sutrasna, Y., & Halkis, M. (2019). Potensi Pembangunan Kawasan Perbatasan Kabupaten Sambas Provinsi Kalimantan Barat dalam Perspektif Ekonomi Pertahanan (Analytic Network Process (ANP)). *Jurnal Ekonomi Pertahanan*, 5(1), 165–192. <http://www.politik.lipi.go.id/kolom/kolom-2/politik-nasional/755-kebijakan-pengelolaan-perbatasan>
- Miagina, A., Biso, H., & Kembauw, E. (2021). Sustainable development through the One Village One Product (OVOP) approach for local commodities. *IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science*, 755(1), 1–7. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/755/1/012071>
- Mukai, K., & Fujikura, R. (2015). One village one product: evaluations and lessons learnt from OVOP aid projects. *Development in Practice*, 25(3), 389–400. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2015.1020763>
- Mylonas, H., & Tudor, M. (2023). Varieties of Nationalism. In *Varieties of Nationalism*. Cambridge University Press. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781108973298>
- Nirwahyudi, T. (2021, May 26). *Sambas Tingkatkan Perekonomian Berbasis Sumber Daya Alam*. Media Indonesia. <https://mediaindonesia.com/nusantara/407424/sambas-tingkatkan-perekonomian-berbasis-sumber-daya-alam>
- O'Toole, L. J. (2004). The theory-practice issue in policy implementation research. *Public Administration*, 82(2), 309–329. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.0033-3298.2004.00396.x>
- Pane, E. (2019). The Reconstruction of Village Governance Towards Good Governance (Study in Kalianda District, South Lampung Regency). *FIAT JUSTISIA: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum*, 13(1), 1–18. <https://doi.org/10.25041/fiatjustisia.v13no1.1471>
- Pathuloh, A., Zulkarnaen, I., & Zairusi. (2019). Indonesian-Malaysian Border Area Msmes Development Model With One Village One Product (OVOP) Approach. *Proceedings of the 5th of International Seminar on Border Region*, 1–9.
- Pollini, G. (2005). Socio-territorial belonging in a changing society. In *International Review of Sociology* (Vol. 15, Issue 3, pp. 493–496). <https://doi.org/10.1080/03906700500272467>
- PPID Kabupaten Sambas. (n.d.). *Potensi Daerah Kabupaten Sambas*. PPID Kabupaten Sambas. Retrieved November 22, 2023, from <https://ppid.sambas.go.id/potensi-daerah/>
- Pülzl, H., & Treib, O. (2007). Implementing Public Policy. In F. Fischer, G. J. Miller, & M. S. Sidney (Eds.), *Handbook of Public Policy Analysis Theory, Politics, and Methods* (pp. 89–107). Taylor and Francis Group .
- Putri, C. M., Argilés-Bosch, J. M., & Ravenda, D. (2023). Creating good village governance: an effort to prevent village corruption in Indonesia. *Journal of Financial Crime*. <https://doi.org/10.1108/jfc-11-2022-0266>
- Rosenthal, G. (2018). *Interpretive Social Research: An Introduction*. Göttingen University Press.
- Rusdiono, & Rochmawati, I. (2020). *Metafora Arena Pengelolaan Perbatasan di Indonesia Studi di PLBN Aruk Kabupaten Sambas Provinsi Kalimantan Barat*. Scofindo Media Pustaka.

- Saetren, H. (2005). Facts and myths about research on public policy implementation: Out-of-fashion, allegedly dead, but still very much alive and relevant. *Policy Studies Journal*, 33(4), 559–582. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1541-0072.2005.00133.x>
- Sega, J., & Suzuki, K. (2019). Beyond the One Village One Product (OVOP) Concept through Design Thinking Approach. *International Journal of Education and Research*, 7(4).
- Setiawan, A. (2019). *Membangun Indonesia Dari Pinggiran Desa*. Sekretariat Kabinet Republik Indonesia. <https://setkab.go.id/membangun-indonesia-dari-pinggiran-desa/>
- Sudagung, A. D. (2021). Indonesia's Border Security and Political Nationalism Means in Dealing with Nationalism Problem at Indonesia-Malaysia Border Area (2009-2014). *International Journal of Environment, Architecture, and Societies*, 1(01), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.26418/ijeas.2021.1.01.1-11>
- Sudagung, A. D., & Chalid, A. M. (2016). Hubungan Transnasional di Kawasan Asia Tenggara: Studi Kasus Hubungan Masyarakat Indonesia-Malaysia di Perbatasan Kalimantan Barat dan Sarawak. *Seminar Nasional II Pengembangan Ilmu Pengetahuan Dan Teknologi*, 309–319.
- Sudagung, A. D., & Rezasyah, T. (2020). Sekuritisasi Keamanan Sosial Masyarakat Perbatasan, Studi Kasus Indonesia-Malaysia. *Analisis CSIS*, 49(3), 330–346.
- Sudagung, A. D., & SD, H. A. (2020). Kebijakan Nawa Cita sebagai Dasar Pembangunan di Kawasan Perbatasan Kalimantan Barat. *Jurnal Review Politik*, 10(02), 1–23.
- Suryabrata, S. (2012). *Metodologi Penelitian*. Rajawali Pers.
- Susilowati, N., Mahmud, A., Widhiastuti, R., & Rahman- ingtyas, W. (2020). Good Village Governance: Internal Control Model of Village Funds Management. *International Conference on Economics, Business and Economic Education 2019*, 137–148. <https://doi.org/10.18502/kss.v4i6.6594>
- Syakrani, & Syahriani. (2009). *Implementasi Otonomi Daerah dalam Perspektif Good Governance*. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Sya'rawie, M. M. (2021, May 26). *Kabupaten Sambas Siap Tarik Investor Lewat 3 Sektor Potensial*. Bisnis.Com. <https://kalimantan.bisnis.com/read/20210526/408/1398210/kabupaten-sambas-siap-tarik-investor-lewat-3-sektor-potensial>
- Thi, N., & Thu, A. (2013). One Village One Product (OVOP) in Japan to One Tambon One Product (OTOP) in Thailand: Lessons for Grass Root Development in Developing Countries. *Journal of Social and Development Sciences*, 4(12), 529–537. [www.ovop.jp/en/ison\\_p](http://www.ovop.jp/en/ison_p)
- Wang, H., & Yuan, L. (2021). Why good governance goes wrong: Government and village in the supply of public goods in rural China. *Rural China*, 18(2), 192–223. <https://doi.org/10.1163/22136746-12341274>
- Whitsel, L. P., Ajenikoko, F., Chase, P. J., Johnson, J., McSwain, B., Phelps, M., Radcliffe, R., & Faghy, M. A. (2023). Public policy for healthy living: How COVID-19 has changed the landscape. In *Progress in Cardiovascular Diseases* (Vol. 76, pp. 49–56). W.B. Saunders. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pcad.2023.01.002>
- Widiyanti, A. (2018). A Comparative Study: One Village One Product (OVOP) As An Engine Of Local Economic Development In Japan And Indonesia. *JURNAL LITBANG SUKOWATI*, 1(2), 80–94.
- Widodo, J. (2001). *Good Governance: Telaah dari Dimensi Akuntabilitas dan Kontrol Birokrasi Pada Era Desentralisasi dan Otonomi Daerah*. Insan Cendekia.
- Wilson, T. M., & Donnan, H. (2012). Borders and Border Studies. In *A Companion to Border Studies* (pp. 1–25). Blackwell Publishing Ltd.