

THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF HUMANITIES & SOCIAL STUDIES

Inter-Stakeholders Collaboration Strategy in the Cross-Border Services of the Harjodaksino Traditional Market in the Border Area of the City of Surakarta, Indonesia

Hadi Wahyono

Lecturer, Department of Urban and Regional Planning, Diponegoro University, Indonesia

Achmad Djunaedi

Lecturer, Department of Architecture and Planning, Gajah Mada University, Indonesia

Bakti Setiawan

Lecturer, Department of Architecture and Planning, Gajah Mada University, Indonesia

Leksono Subanu

Lecturer, Department of Architecture and Planning, Gajah Mada University, Indonesia

Abstract:

In Indonesia, the cross-border cooperation between the adjacent regions in the implementation of government affairs which has cross-regional externalities and the provision of public services more efficient if managed together is a mandatory regional cooperation. Under the regulation, the cross-border services of the Harjodaksino Markets are the mandatory inter-regions cooperation. However, given that the service is open to everyone, regardless of the origin of the user community, the cooperation is carried out not in the form of inter-region institutions, but in the user community of the traditional market. The market is managed directly by the Government of Surakarta without going through interaction with other regions. Given that the interaction between the regions is a collaborative planning process, it is necessary the explanations of inter-regions collaboration strategies used in such interaction. Based on the state of affairs of the problems explained above, the research objective discussed in this article is to examine how inter-regional collaboration strategies are used in the interaction of the parties involved in the management of the Harjodaksino Market, and what matters that influence it. This research used the Straussian grounded theory strategy, as the strategy could meet the characteristics of the research. Established along its characteristics, the interaction uses the functionary assertive-collaboration strategy. It is a functional strategy as all stakeholders emphasize on the integration of cross-regions border service functions of the traditional market. The strategy is assertive as all stakeholders have self confidence in holding out the use of the service. It is also because they reckon that the border area is a frontier area as a means of looking forward the potentials from the neighboring neighborhoods, using direct planning strategy, collaboration management strategy and done using without mediation strategy.

Keywords: *collaboration strategy, collaborative planning, border area, traditional market.*

1. Introduction

A market is a public facility that accommodates the activities of buying and selling goods of daily needs. Basically, the market is open to the public, so that everyone, both the merchant and the buyer has the right to engage in buying and selling into it. According to Presidential Decree No. 112/2007 on the Management and Development of Traditional Markets, Shopping Centers and Modern Stores, the market is the area where the sale of goods by the number of merchants of more than one well known as a shopping center, traditional markets, shops, malls, plazas, center of trade and other designations. While traditional market is a meeting place for buyers and merchants to transact directly, and usually through the bargaining process. In other words, the market is called traditional, because its transaction and purchasing are done traditionally, which is characterized by the buyer and merchant transactions are done directly, face to face, and through a process of bargaining price. In contrast to the modern market, which apply a fixed price that is written and readable by the buyer, the clarity and certainty of the price of goods in the traditional markets should be asked in advance to the merchant.

In general, the traditional market that is growing increasingly large, will be repaired by the local government from a non-permanent to be a permanent building. Some traditional markets built by private and government-owned enterprises. However, traditional market development is often done by the local government, or through cooperation between the government and the private sector. Therefore,

the operational management of the market, which is built by local governments, conducted by the management unit formed specifically by the local government.

The traditional market management agency in the region government level, particularly in urban areas are usually in the form of the Office of the Market Management (the DPP-*Dinas Pengelolaan Pasar*). This office oversees several areas of work relating to the management of all traditional markets of the region, such as maintenance, cleaning, security and finance. While the institutions that manage directly the traditional markets are usually in the form of the Technical Management Unit (the UPT-*Unit Pengelola Teknis*). Technical management unit is usually led by a chief manager of the market, that in Central Java province he or she is often called *lurah pasar* (the headman of the market). The *lurah pasar* has responsibility for the life continuity of the market.

Because of managing by the local government, the traditional market management operations are usually financed from the local government budgets. The budget is usually derived from the taxes charged by the merchants who use the markets, as well as from various other sources of revenue. Thus, the financing market management derived from the market income plus various other local revenues. Because financed by the region, of course, a function of the market should be enjoyed by the residents of the region. However, because it is open for public, the traditional markets not only serve the local population, but also serve the beneficiaries of neighboring regions and other regions.

As a traditional market is usually open for public, it can receive and serve the merchants and buyers from anywhere. Although the market is built and managed by the local government, its service is open for public, which everybody can attend and use it without regard to the origin of the buyer and the merchant. Therefore, the traditional market service area is usually not tied to the local administrative region, but it is functional, which provides services to all people from everywhere.

One market that has such characteristics is the Harjodaksino Market. The market is a traditional market in the border area of the City of Surakarta with the Regency of Sukoharjo. The market precisely located in the border region, which is in the District Serengan, the City of Surakarta, which is directly adjacent to the District of Grogol, the Regency of Sukoharjo. As the location of the two districts that is adjoin, it possible for merchants and buyers from outside districts, especially the District of Grogol even from other regions outside of the city for participating in the activities of buying and selling in the market which are in the territory of the city.

As stated by the Law of Indonesia No. 23/2014 on the Local Governance, the cooperation between neighboring regions are mandatory. The cooperation shall be developed jointly between the adjacent areas for the implementation of government affairs which have cross-regions externalities; and the provision of public services will more efficient if managed together. Under the provisions of these regulations, the use of the Harjodaksino Market by some neighboring regions of the City of Surakarta included in the delivery of government affairs which has a cross-regions externalities. Therefore, the implementation must be undertaken in the form of inter-regions cooperation.

In fact, although the Harjodaksino Market has been exploited by merchants and buyers from various neighboring regions, but the management of the market does not involve neighboring local governments. The market is managed directly by the Government of Surakarta without going through interaction with other regions. This management is not in accordance with the Law No. 23/2014 on the Local Governance.

This demonstrates that although it has been articulated through legislation that the interaction between regions that has cross-regions externalities is an obligation, actually, it cannot be undertaken easily in the border area of regions. This is caused by the difficulty to bring direct inter-regions autonomy interaction in the region. Given that the interaction between the regions is a collaborative planning process, it is necessary the explanations of inter-regions collaboration strategies used in the usage of the traditional market.

Based on the state of affairs of the problems explained above, the research discussed in this article has the following research questions: How inter-regional collaboration strategies used in the interaction of the parties involved in the management of the Harjodaksino Market, and why? Based on the research question, the objective of the research discussed in this article can be formulated that is to examine how inter-regional collaboration strategies are used in the interaction of the parties involved in the management of water utilization of the Harjodaksino Market, and what matters that influence it.

2. Collaboration Strategy

The collaboration strategy is theoretically discussed as the focus of the research is on the interaction that involve several parties in using a public facility, the Harjodaksino Market. The objective of the interaction is reaching the optimal use of the Harjodaksino Market that can provide benefits to all its users equitably and sustainably. To achieve the objective, the process of planning needs to be based on the collaborative planning approach. The collaborative planning approach is a practical approach to communicative planning theory, which emphasizes the building process of agreement or understanding between the involved parties involved (O'Leary and Vij, 2012; O'Flynn and Wanna, 2008; Healey, 2006).

Gray (1989) remarked that the collaboration is the procedure of interaction between the parties who determine a problem from different sides, explore the differences between them, and find solutions together. The result is a joint opinion adopted by all parties involved in the planning as discussed and negotiated. The foundation of the solution becomes the focal point in the collaborative planning process for not only to share information, but also to produce an innovative and creative activity to obtain the solution together. The result is not just built through sharing of info, but also a change of ideas, thoughts, potentials, power authorities, and political force.

Recently, planners have used the collaborative planning for involving parties, such as the government, private and public, in holding the interests of the public (Healey, 2006; Margerum, 2002). In the metropolitan area, particularly in inter-regions cooperation in urban areas, the planners use the planning on the interaction between the regions for building the cooperation between regions (McCarthy, 2007). Because the interactions between regions are altered, the planning also has various sorts of characteristics of with different

collaborative natures. In order for the right kind of action, planners using the collaborative strategies to determine the type of collaborative action.

Taking on the collaborative planning approach requires collaboration strategies. In this inquiry, the definition of the inter-regions collaboration strategy is the collaborations between the parts to construct answers to sweep over the problems in urban areas in the city border. The strategy is the general direction to take an action. Thus, the strategies need more various operational directions, that are action plans and performance managements. An action plan is operational directives will be implemented. While the execution management is required to guide the implementation.

Based on Healey (1991), the strategic collaboration can be grouped into five styles of action planning, namely: 1) the social reform planning style, which is planning directed to meet the interests of the community, as part of social reform process; 2) the policy analysis planning style, which is planning directed on the planners' expertise as a policy analyst; 3) the managerial planning style, which intends to manage the fulfillment of the interests of the community; 4) the intermediation planning style, which is planning directed to the tasks of government, who regard the region as its own regional interaction with its neighbors; and 5) the bureaucratic planning style, which is planning directed to the government administration. In short, the strategy of inter-regions collaboration is a collaborative action plan utilized by planners to build a joint of agreement, through the bureaucratic approach, intermediation, social reform, or managerial and policy analysis styles.

Based on the concept of Thomas (1976, 1992) on the conflict management, the management styles of collaboration strategy has two types namely: 1) the assertive strategy, which focuses only to promote their own interests, which consists of the avoiding management style, which sees the existence of the border area is not important, and the competition management style, which exploits the potential of the border area for the benefit of their own region of the avoiding management style and competition management style; and 2) the cooperative strategy, which is more concerned with the interests of other parties, which consists of the accommodation management style, which accommodates the management of its neighbors to jointly exploit the border area, and the collaborative management style, which intends to build collaborative agreement among the stakeholders. Besides, there are the fifth style, the compromise management style, that put forward a compromise between the city and its neighbors in the development of the border areas.

As well the collaborative planning, the collaboration strategy also requires management mediation. Mediation is a procedure of engaging a third party, called a mediator in an interaction (Horowitz, 2007). In the border areas of the city, the mediator bridging the interaction between the city and its neighbors. Accordion Riskin (1996), the mediation styles consists of two characters, namely facilitative and evaluative mediation. Facilitative mediation is a mediation that provides an ambiance conducive to facilitating the parties to establish consensus. In this meditation, planners act as intermediaries that bridges the interaction in the procedure of planning (Healey, 1991). While evaluative mediation is mediation that mimics the trial in court. The mediation is like the judge who issued decisions that must be established by the parties to the conflict. In this example, the planner uses his expertise to evaluate the conflict, and provide answers to resolve the difference.

3. Research Methods

The characteristics of the research that seeks to examine the facts in the field, show that in general the research approach is founded on inductive logic. Inductive logic is a way of remembering to draw general conclusions from the individual facts. Corresponding to the inductive logic, by examining individual to the object under research will get details of the object studied. Nevertheless, because of the research deals with conventional theories that have been there, especially the theory of collaborative planning, the effects of the research cannot abide alone, only dispenses with conventional theories, particularly the theory of collaborative provision. In other words, this research also utilizes an advance based on deductive logic. Deductive logic is logic to draw conclusions from general statements into an account or a specific person. The condition of its use is the use of theoretical subjects are meant to concentrate along the knowledge that need to be studied in this research, which is oftentimes named to as background knowledge.

Background knowledge will be used as an exemplar of a theory that is employed as a reference researchers to facilitate the preparation of research outcomes, particularly with respect to the use of terms that are often used theoretically, to excuse the facts found in the area. Nevertheless, the development of concepts and theories in the research is still based on the facts on the ground.

Specifically, this research used grounded theory research strategy. Grounded theory research intends to explore a variety of specifications of the object, such as the characteristics of the condition, the causes, implications, and consequences arising from the existence of the object. The solutions are extrapolated into an analytical abstraction scheme on the target, in the frame of a theoretical framework that explains the natural process, interaction or process. Surveys conducted on the results of consultations, field visits as a theoretical concept, to be used to establish and connect and categorize the data received through the comparison and formulate them into specific and contextual theory (Strauss and Corbin, 1990).

According to Jones and Alony (2011), grounded theory research consisted of two mainstreams, which Glasserian and Straussian mainstreams. According to the Glaserian mainstream, the grounded theory researchers should begin research with a empty mind. Meanwhile, Straussian mainstream allows the usage of general thought. Consequently, the Graserian mainstream naturally requires excavation of the field, while the Straussian mainstream suggest the use of structured questions and observations as an attempt to bring up the theory. According to the Straussian mainstream, to formulate questions and structured observations, researchers are allowed to use theoretical studies. Accordingly, this research used the mainstream. To concentrate on the inquiry on this estimate, the researchers conducted formulating of the problem, building a framework, conducting theoretical studies, and applying the results to develop structured guidelines interviews and field observations.

There are five (5) steps that need to be done to produce a theory on grounded theory research, Creswell (1998) describes the steps the research data on grounded theory research, which is in harmony with the flow of Straussian, namely: 1) Organize any data obtained

from the field, 2) read the entire information and formulate it into formulas field findings, 3) To review the open coding, which is the process of grouping the information of all the facts, and formulate it into categories in each unit of analysis. At this stage, the researchers conducted the naming in the form of keywords based on the attributes (properties) unit of analysis, grouping and outlining the facts compiled based on the findings of the field, which is formulated from the text of the interview, observation, and field notes. Furthermore, by using thematic analysis, key words are categorized into sub-categories. Sub-categories resulting re categorized into categories. At the categorization phase, researchers connect various key words to attribute the unit of analysis, which is done by connecting the codes, using a combination approach of inductive and deductive way of thinking; 4) Conduct a research coding pivot, namely reviewing the categories generated from open coding of the units of analysis. Researchers check back in a framework to validate the existence of the categories that exist in every attribute of the unit of analysis; 5) Perform selective coding, which integrates the category-kategori resulting from coding research pivots, into an overarching concept. At this stage of selective coding research, the researchers chose the core categorization with regard research goals and objectives, and connects the attributes of the core category.

4. Overview of the Harjodaksino Market

As a traditional market, the Harjodaksino Market or often referred to as the Gemblegan Market, trades various goods of daily necessities, such as the nine basic needs which are rice, sugar, cooking oil and butter, beef and chicken, chicken eggs, milk, corn, kerosene and iodized salt; a variety of food and drinks; as well as various services. Besides providing daily necessities, the market also provides a variety of pastries and a variety of other types of traditional foods. The market is very famous as a place to sell a variety of specialties old days. Besides, the market is known the market for traditional marriage ceremony goods (ubo rampe perkawinan).

Most of the goods traded in the Harjodaksino Market come from outside the District of Serangan, even a lot of commodity coming from outside the City of Surakarta. Commodities originating from outside the city usually in the form of vegetables, which comes from vegetable producing areas, such as market Cepogo in the Regency of Boyolali and Tawangmangu Market in the Regency of Karanganyar. Similarly, fruits, obtained from the producing regions, and even across the province, as of the Regency of Malang in the East Java Province. Some merchants, particularly small food merchants get their goods not only from within the province such as the Regency of Kudus, but also from outside the province, such as the City of Surabaya and the Regency of Bogor. Originally commodity illustrates that the market service area is a cross-border area.

The Harjodaksino Market is one market in Surakarta which will undergo refurbishment into the market with better and modern public facilities. The detailed engineering design of this restoration plan has been completed in 2014 and is being implemented through funding from the central government. Unfortunately, the restoration of the market delayed, due to the requirement of the specified minimum area for the market to be restored at the expense of the central government was not able to be met by the market.

The restoration of this market will be carried out and completed in 2016. The restoration of this market is done as part of a policy of the City Surakarta to maintain and protect traditional markets. Meanwhile, business activity in Surakarta is growing conditions and the situation of the city's business activities are more advanced can urge the existence of traditional markets. To deal with this, the traditional markets need to be restored in order to keep up with the growth of various supermarkets, malls and various shopping centers more modern.

Based on data obtained from the DPP of the City of Surakarta In 2013, merchants who sell at the Harjodaksino Market not only from the city of Surakarta, but also in the surrounding regions. Of the total number of merchants around 800 people, the percentage of merchants who come from outside the city reached more than half, which is about 56.92%, which is composed of 38.38% comes from the Regency of Sukoharjo and the rest of the Regencies of Boyolali, Klaten, Karanganyar, and Sragen. Meanwhile, the number of merchants from the city amounted to 44.18% of the total merchant.

As with the merchant who came from various regions in Surakarta and neighboring regions, consumers or buyers who visit Harjodaksino Market also comes from various regions. With visitor numbers approximately 1,400 people per day who come from different regions causes Harjodaksino markets can be grouped into the market area, because it has a relatively large number of consumers and from different regions. Thus, it can be formulated that although the market is a market Harjodaksino owned, built and managed by the Government of Surakarta, but in fact, this market is used by merchants who come from outside the city of Surakarta.

The Harjodaksino Market was completed and inaugurated in 1986 by the Governor of Central Java at the time, H. Ismail. The market is built using funds from the City Government of Surakarta is intended to combine the three traditional markets that are close together, that are Gading, Dawung and Gemblegan Markets. The merger of the third adjacent markets had made a bigger market with more efficient, especially in its management.

Overall the market is built on a land area of 8997 m². The Harjodaksino Market is a market with a Class IB. As the market with Class IB, meaning the market has a complete market by 71% - 86% of all facilities and market infrastructures. This market class often determine the scope of the service area. In general, markets with Class I (A) is a market that provides services crossing the boundaries of the district administration area.

Besides the potential of its strategic location and easily accessible, the completeness of facilities and infrastructure is another potential cause the Harjodaksino Market favored by merchants and buyers from not only the city of Surakarta, but also from the border area of the Regency of Sukoharjo. As with other traditional markets, these markets have the means of trade stalls and kiosks. In 2006, the market undertook the development of new kiosks at the front, so that it increased the market capacity of his trading. In 2011, the market have 979 units and 80 units of stalls.

Besides completeness of existing infrastructure, the Harjodaksino market appeal is the condition of the building that is still well maintained. Although built in 1986, until today, the condition of the market building still looks good. Development is done on the

front in 2006 has led to the appearance of the whole building market becomes more attractive, as it displays a variety of vernacular architecture that combines traditional and colonial buildings in the city of Surakarta.

The other attractiveness of Harjodaksino Market is on the completeness and uniqueness of commodities that do not exist in other markets. Some commodities are typical of this market are various traditional marriage ceremony goods (ubo rampe perkawinan). In addition, some merchants in this market selling traditional foods and the famous ancient of the City of Surakarta and surrounding areas, such as blanggreng, cabuk rambak, grontol, limpung, thymus, marneng, ampyang, tingting obese, uwi, mbili, canna, godril, dhele godhog, and others. The market is often to be used as a reference to some people in the border area of the city and the Regency of Sukoharjo and other neighboring regions for culinary in this market. Additionally, commodities such as brass bowl, a chew of betel or goods originating from brass are also available in this market. Nevertheless, the famous commodity of the market remains groceries.

Other conditions that encourage the entry of merchants from outside the City of Surakarta to trade in the Harjodaksino Market is open acceptance of the merchants who came from inside the City of Surakarta. Merchants of the Harjodaksino Market incorporated in the Society of Traditional Market Merchant (P3T-Paguyuban Pedagang Pasar Tradisional) of the Harjodaksino Market. This community has a tolerant nature, which does not distinguish the origin of the merchants. All members have the same rights and obligations, in accordance with its constitution/ bylaws community. The P3T officially formed in 1986. Since the opening of the market, the P3T have been a member of the Association of the Society of Traditional Market Merchants of the City of Surakarta (P3TKS-Persatuan Paguyuban Pasar Tradisional Kota Surakarta). The association efforts include managing the security officers to secure the market, and create harmony among merchants. The officers are selected from local residents and the suggestion of merchants. In addition, the society serves to accommodate the aspirations of merchants to be delivered to the market manager. In short, the society play an important role in strengthening the harmony between merchants.

The interaction between users of the traditional markets, including the Harjodaksino Market are different from the interactions that take place in the modern market. Because the goal of the modern market is doing transactions as effective and efficient as possible, then the transaction that happen to be economical, without trying to build social interaction is between the merchant and the buyer. Forms of transactions in the modern market is taking its own supermarket shoppers traded goods and bring it to the cashier for payment, without doing deep interaction with the waiter or clerk of the market, except for asking matters relating to the goods to be purchased.

Meanwhile, in traditional markets, the interaction happens not merely in the form of transactions, but also social interaction to strengthen relations and social ties between merchants and buyers. The Harjodaksino Market is managed by the DPP of the City of Surakarta. As stated in Regulation of the Surakarta Mayor No. 15/2011 on the Translation of Main Duties, Functions and Working Procedure of the DPP of the City of Surakarta, the DPP has a fundamental duty held responsible in the management and protection of traditional markets. The regulation does not mention that the office has a duty to select merchants based on their origin. In other words, the regulation establishes the entire traditional markets in Surakarta, including the Harjodaksino Market, is open for the benefit of all people, including merchants and buyers from various regions, not only of the city alone, but also from outside the city.

Apparently, the most important of the objectives of the management of the market that is assigned to the DPP is that the market can be operated and maintained properly, so it is always crowded, comfortable, safe and clean, and can generate revenue to the City Government of Surakarta. Thus, the market not only serves to facilitate the activities of transactions between merchants and buyers, but also a source of local revenue for the city. Revenue from this market is managed exclusively by one of the field offices, that is the Market Revenue Division.

Each year, the Office of the Market Management set revenue targets for all traditional markets in the City of Surakarta. The revenue targets set by the office increased annually by 10%, but the realization of the resulting often can not meet the target. That is because of the rarely increasing number of stalls and kiosks. To meet the increasing target, the office have to increase the number of stalls and kiosks.

5. Research Findings and Discussion

The borderline of the City of Surakarta with the Regency of Sukoharjo has been agreed by the two regions, including in the areas where the Harjodaksino Market is located, which is in the District of Serengan, the City of Surakarta and the District of Grogol, the Regency of Sukoharjo. Location of the districts that are contiguous allows for merchants and buyers from outside the districts, especially the District of Grogol even from other regions outside the city for participating in the activities of buying and selling in the market which are in the territory of the city of Surakarta.

Meanwhile, the border areas, particularly in the District of Kartosura, the Regency of Sukoharjo, has grown in urban areas because of the influence of the City of Surakarta. The integration of the regions not only in physical form regions, but also in economic and social activities, including the use of public facilities, including utilization Harjodaksino Market. As a result, most of the physical form of the city boundary line between two adjacent districts that are not visible because it has grown into an urban area on the border have been integrated. Bookmarks border town that looks a gate located on the main streets.

This interaction between regions in the cross-border services on the Harjodaksino Market is not a formal inter-regions interaction, but informally. It is because the interaction is undertaken by the people who use the traditional market, both originally from within the City of Surakarta, as well as from neighboring regions. It is because the City Government of Surakarta, particularly the DPP of the City of Surakarta that owns and manages the Harjodaksino Market, looking at the market located in the border region is a common means for anyone about to try and trade in it, including people from outside the City of Surakarta. Meanwhile, the P3T of the market also permit everyone to trade, regardless of their origin.

Borrowing the term of Blatter (2006), the perception of the DPP of the City of Surakarta, and the P3T of the Harjodaksino Market consider that the border area where the market is located is a frontier area. It may be used by anyone, in order to increase the market activities. Meanwhile, the merchants and buyers of the market coming from outside the city view that market is in the border region as the frontier area, as it has potential as a means to trade.

Because the interaction is done entirely informal, by the people, especially just by merchants and buyers that occur in Harjodaksino market in the City of Surakarta, there is no formal interaction between the government of the city with neighboring local governments. Nevertheless, the role of local government in this interaction is to provide a common means, in the Harjodaksino Market, as a place for the interaction.

Based on the explanations, it can be articulated that the interaction between regions that occur are due to cooperative strategy of the DPP of the City of Surakarta that gives permission to the people in neighboring regions, the Regency of Sukoharjo and other regions to use the Harjodaksino Market. The cooperative strategy is open, because Harjodaksino Market Management Unit allows people from outside the city of Surakarta occupy the market without implementing complex bureaucratic requirements. To trade in the Harjodaksino Market, prospective merchants from the border region and other areas of the Regency of Sukoharjo only need to collect ID card, proof of right to use los or kiosk from previous users, without a letter of recommendation from the area of origin.

Judging from the kind of planning, utilization planning the Harjodaksino Market using social reform planning approach, as put forward the interests of the user community the market, with the aim to maintain market presence Harjodaksino as traditional markets. Approach to planning social reforms in the traditional market for the purpose of maintaining social capital formed in the market, which has supported the lives and welfare of the community users.

The process of planning, development and management of the Harjodaksino Market have undertaken entirely by the DPP of the City of Surakarta. Planning is done entirely by the office, with the involvement of the P3T of the market. While the implementation of the planning carried out by the office. Planning and implementation process involving the government office and other community, including the Planning Board of the city and the community users of the Harjodaksino Markets in running the planning process.

Judging from the recipient interaction, the position of the user community of the Harjodaksino Market, the inter-regional interaction management positions in the area of cross-border services in the border region of the market is the first management. The nature of the interaction in this management is undetaking the local government policy, namely the utilization of market services of the market, built and managed by the City of Surakarta, by people who come from several areas in the border area in particular the Regency of Sukoharjo and other neighboring areas.

In the interaction between cross-border regions in the service area of the Harjodaksino Market, the City Government of Surakarta, especially the DPP of the city has an important role, since its function is to plan and control the entire service of the traditional markets in Surakarta, including Harjodaksino Market. To carry out the roles, the office formed the UPT of the Harjodaksino Market, in charge of managing market income; cleanliness and maintenance of the market; supervision and oversight of market merchants and street vendors; los arrangements and market stalls; security and order of market and street vendors; and socialization as well as guidance to the user market.

Meanwhile, based on the characteristics of the interaction, in particular locations that are on the market interaction Harjodaksino managed by the Government of Surakarta, and actor interaction consisting of merchants and buyers who come from the city of Surakarta and the various regions neighboring the city, it can be concluded that this type of interaction This research is a cooperative interaction. According to Thomas (1976, 1992), cooperative interactions occur because one of the parties that interact is to accommodate the wishes or authorize others to exploit its potential.

Therefore, the market planning and management should be done with regard to the potential of social capital that has been living in it. To implement such a plan, the DPP of the City of Surakarta in general and in particular the UPT of the Harjodaksino Market use social reform planning style. The planning style is a planning approach that emphasizes on the elements that live in a society that is contained in the substances of planning (Healey, 1991). In other words, this approach not only seeks to the development plan as the government desires, but also to maintain and even increase the capacity of social capital present in a community.

Meanwhile, if viewed from the characteristics of urban management, to borrow a from terms of Thomas (1976, 1992), this research can be formulated that the management style of the interaction uses the compromise management. It is because the City Government of Surakarta compromise with the people of the city and neighboring regions to exploit together the traditional markets in the city. The reason to use the style is in order to the market becoming crowded, so as it can increase the local revenues through the taxes charged from the merchants.

In the terms of the mediation management, the interaction between regions in this research does not use third party as a mediator. Interaction is done directly between merchants, buyers, or other users who support the transaction, such as a parking lot, and the sweeper market. This can occur because of the policy of the DPP of the City of Surakarta which allows merchants and other users who come from outside the region to trade in the Harjodaksino Market of the city.

The conflict in the Harjodaksino Market had ever happened, in the form of conflicts between merchants in 2012. The conflict occurred because some unofficial merchants, called *oprokan* merchant, traded in the open space area outside the building of the Harjodaksino Market. This leads to official merchants who occupy stalls and kiosks in the market, appealed to them for causing buyers are reluctant to enter into the market. The reluctance of buyers led to the decline in the number of buyers who enter the market, and resulted in a decreased turnover official merchants who occupy the stalls and stalls in the market as a result. These problems successfully resolved through mediation conducted by the P3T of the market, which involves the UPT of the market.

6. Conclusions

The Inter-users planning that occurred on the object of this research is on the cross-border services of the Harjodaksino Market in the border area of the City of Surakarta and the Regency of Sukoharjo. The interaction between regions that occur are not formally intergovernmental, but among the people who use the Harjodaksino Market as a place to trade. They come from various regions, not only from the city, but also from the surrounding regions, such as the Regencies of Sukoharjo, Klaten, Boyolali and Karanganyar. They consist of traders, buyers and other users, who met in the market for economic interaction in the form of transaction items daily needs. In these interactions, they merge into one, regardless of their origins.

Interaction between regions in this research is the interaction cross-border service of traditional markets located in the border area of the City of Surakarta. Although the market is owned and managed by the city government, the interaction does not involve the local institutions. This interaction involves only the users of the market from the city, neighboring towns and even other regions. The city government that owns and manages the market allow all people to be able to take advantage of the market, regardless of their origin.

According to the Law No. 23/2014 on Regional Government, the mandatory regional cooperation is cooperation between the regions adjacent to the implementation of Government Affairs which has cross-regional externalities; and the provision of public services more efficient if managed together. Under the regulation, cross-border services Harjodaksino Markets are services that are inter-regional cooperation. However, given that the service is open to everyone, regardless of the origin of the user community, the cooperation is carried out not in the form of inter-regional institutions. Cooperation among the region was done between people who use the market.

Established along the characteristics of the interaction, it can be concluded that all stakeholders involve in the cross-regions border services on the Harjodaksino Market in the border region of the City of Surakarta use the functionary assertive-collaboration strategy. The use of functional strategy because in the interaction, all stakeholders emphasizes the integration of cross-regions border service functions, that is the Harjodaksino Market services. The operational strategy is assertive as all stakeholders have self confidence in holding out the use of the service, to the border areas of the neighboring regions through cross-regions border services. It is also because they reckon that the border area is a frontier area as a means of looking forward the potentials from the neighboring regions, using direct planning strategy, collaboration management strategy and done using without mediation strategy.

The collaboration strategy is in conformity with the conditions desired by the stakeholders in the interaction, because it can offer benefits; provision and execution has been agreed upon, integrated and does not violate the autonomy of each neighborhood; and the interaction is executed by taking a third party as a mediator that facilitates the interaction of common esteem, respect and put every region in the same attitude and condition. Until immediately, the inter-regions collaboration strategies are deemed effective enough to confirm the carrying out of inter-regions agreement on handling the cross-regions border services of the traditional market in the border region of the City of Surakarta.

The research discussed in this article demonstrates the role of the case of the functional assertive-collaboration strategy. While it is based on literature review has been channeled out, in accession to these types, there are another type of collaboration strategy called territorial cooperative-collaboration strategy. Thus, the recommendations can be deported from the discussion of this article is a continuation of research that addresses the interaction between the object area in the border region using the scheme.

7. Acknowledgment

The author would like to thank Himmatul Ulya, because some substances of this article are taken from her undergraduate thesis. The author, especially Hadi Wahyono is a faculty mentor in her thesis writing.

8. References

- i. Creswell, J. W. (1998). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: Choosing among five traditions*. London, Sage Publications, Inc.
- ii. Gray, B. (1989). *Collaborating: Finding common ground for multiparty problems*. San Francisco, CA, Jossey-Bass Publishers,.
- iii. Healey, P. (1991). *Debates in planning thought*, in H. Thomas and P. Healey (editor): *Dilemmas of Planning Practice*. Avebury, Aldershot, , pp. 91-97.
- iv. Healey, P. (2006). *Collaborative Planning: Shaping Places in Fragmented Societies (Planning, Environment, Cities)*. New York, Palgrave Macmillan,
- v. Horowitz, S. (2007). *Mediation*; in C. Webel & J. Galtung (eds.), *Handbook of Peace and Conflict Studies*. London, Routledge, , pp. 87-95.
- vi. Jones, M., and Alony, I. (2011). "Guiding the use of Grounded Theory in Doctoral studies: An example from the Australian film industry." *International Journal of Doctoral Studies*, 6 (N/A), pp. 95-114.
- vii. Margerum, R. D. (2002). "Collaborative planning: Building consensus and building a distinct model for practice." *Journal of Planning Education and Research*; 21; pp. 237-248.
- viii. McCarthy, J. (2007). *Partnership, collaborative planning and urban regeneration*. Aldershot, Ashgate,.
- ix. Mintzberg, H. (1994). *The Rise and Fall of Strategic Planning: Reconceiving Roles for Planning, Plans, Planners*. New York: The Free Press,
- x. O'Flynn, J., and Wanna, J. (2008). *Collaborative governance: A new era of public policy in australia?* Canberra, ANU E Press,

- xi. O'Leary, R., and Vij, N. (2012). "Collaborative public management: Where have we been and where are we going?." *The American Review of Public Administration*, 42: pp. 507-516.
- xii. Riskin, L. L. (1996). "Understanding mediators' orientations, strategies and techniques: A grid for perplexed". *Harvard Negotiation Law Review*; 1:7; p. 7- 57.
- xiii. Selden, S., Sowa J., and Sandfort J. (2002). "The impact of nonprofit collaboration in early child care and education on management and program outcomes." *Public Administration Review*, 66 (3), pp. 412-425.
- xiv. Strauss, A. L., and Corbin, J. M. (1998). *Basics of Qualitative Research: Techniques and Procedures for Developing Grounded Theory*. London, Sage Publications, Inc.,.
- xv. Thomas, K. W. (1976). "Conflict and conflict management," in M. D. Dunnette (editor): *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago, Rand McNally, p. 889-935.
- xvi. Thomas, K. W. (1992). "Conflict and conflict management: Reflections and update," in *Journal of Organizational Behavior* (1986-1998); 13, 3; *ABI/INFORM Global*: May, pp. 265-278.