

Intergovernmental Cooperation in provisioning Educational Goods and Service (Study on Intergovernmental on Providence Free Education in South Sulawesi)

Masriadi

Doctoral Program of Administration Science, University of Brawijaya Malang

Abstract: *The practice of the implementation of local government in the context of decentralization has shown positive results on one side, but on the other side there are still variety of lacking. The difficulty to embody the act of collective and the occurrence of inefficiency and ineffectiveness in public service especially on provision of goods and services education is still difficult avoided. The case of cooperation between the government of South Sulawesi with the government of makassar city, district gowa and district boneintended to embody the act of collective and create efficiency and effectiveness of public services, that is the provisioning of free education cannot be separated from the low of collective and still high inefficiency and ineffectiveness in the phase implementation. Cooperation among local governments that built by reason of political and economic so dominant will give impact towards low-self accountability parties who built this cooperation. Cooperation among local government affected by factors of financial capability region, leadership and political interests elite local showed dominant and strong followed by the culture and structure bureaucracy local governments that still thick with cultural paternalistik, nepotism, collusion and corruption and structure bureaucracy parkinsonism to satisfy the desire political and power. Consequently, education goods and services public as victims.*

Keywords: *Decentralization, Intergovernmental Cooperation, Educational Goods and service*

I. Introduction

The Decentralization in Indonesia which occurred since 1999 seems to have significant impact on the improvement of the service quality and the welfare of society (Supriyono, 2010). The phenomenon of the high political cost to finance local democracy on the one hand while on the other hand the phenomenon of poverty low levels of public education in the region, was still low human development index, and lack of providing facilities development in various areas. This happened because the act of collective local governments as that required in decentralized policy has not been fully can be manifested (Supriyono, 2010). Likewise with various pathology of government; as a bribe corruption, collusion and nepotism and bureaucracy parkinsonism also have not insurmountable (Hoessein in Muluk 2009).

For that required formulations and strategies that may involve any tiers regional government to can realize the act of collectively (Supriyono, 2010) in implementing all government affairs under its authority menurut azas decentralization. Intergovernmental relations can be an attractive solution as an effort in realizing the implementation of local governance that is effective, efficient and able to perform such collective action. Relations between the government or Intergovernmental relations (IGR) is an important body of activities or interactions occurring between governmental units of all types and levels (Anderson's, 1960)

One of Intergovernmental relations form is expected to be the means to construct collective action for local governments is the Intergovernmental Cooperation (IGC). Cooperation among governments are expected to tackle fiscal constraints and improve administrative capacity and able to fulfill the political demands faced by the government and regional governments hence demand the need for integrated management policies and integrated. Intergovernmental management/IGM (Agranoff, 1986; Conlan and Posner 2008) is an integrated and integrated management policies required to embody the collective action on cooperation between local governments (Agranoff, 1986).

Cooperation among local governments in the process takes time which long enough like the process of political and administrative even the social process that is relatively cumbersome although cooperation among local governments have been arranged through a government regulation, but in its implementations not always run easily. Reality shows that some of the form of cooperation built still is very fragile and bounded by interest in local politics and the political background of the heads of the region (Firman, 2009)

According to agranoff (1986) some instrument that can affect on cooperation between government between others; intergovernmental enforcement, governmental structures, political forces, bureaucratic and actions and intergovernmental communications. Hence some factor that can affect on cooperation among local

governments that deserves consideration is factor financial capability region, leadership and political interests to regions as well as the structure and culture regional government bureaucracy.

II. Research Focus

Focus of the Research is:

1. The importance of cooperation between local governments in the free education in South Sulawesi based on political reasons economic and administrative
2. The influence of regional financial capabilities, leadership and political interests of regional head, the culture and bureaucratic structures of local government against the cooperation between local governments in the implementation of free education in the province of south sulawesi

III. Theoretical Background

3.1 Intergovernmental Cooperation

Intergovernmental cooperation terms has long been known and conceived as a source of efficiency and the quality of service in the context of decentralization (Laffin, 2007). Coon (2011) describe that Intergovernmental cooperation may be defined as an arrangement between or among two or more local governments for achieving common goals, providing a service or solving a mutual problem (Coon, 2011). In the meanwhile, Patterson (2008) bring up that intergovernmental cooperation, defined as an arrangement between two or more governments for accomplishing common goals, providing a service or solving a mutual problem.

In this definition implied the existence of a common interest that encourages two or more local authorities to deliver services together or solving problems together (Warsono, 2009). This adjustment is setting together (joint) which certainly different characteristics are compared with regulation itself (internal area). Some local governments currently looking for new method to reduce spending and keeping the quality of service, review system service, assign a priority, and determine service which one is rendered through alternate order. Hence can be said that cooperation among local government is way used between one or more government in achieving its goal together, granting merit or solving a problem (Warsono, 2009). In line with Coon (2011) and Peterson (2008), Domai (2009) declaring that cooperation can improve the quality of service, for example in the provision of facilities, or procuring where each can't buy it haphazardly.

By cooperation, any facility servicing that's bloody expensive, can be bought and enjoyed by public as a recreational center, adult education, transportation, medical equipment that sophisticated and others. Cooperation among local governments in the sectors that agreed to reach the value of efficiency and effectiveness as well as the quality of public services better.

Post(2002) bring up that local intergovernmental cooperation broadly defined, included all policy activities that require some level of policy coordination between one or more local government. Hence cooperation among local government in providing public goods (goods and services) intended to reduce gap among local dirumsukan into one policy together. Cooperation among local governments can also serves to control conflict, improve services, empowerment of public participation and enhance efficiency and effectiveness of the use of resources.

Akramov and Assante (2008) suggest that geographical location and ethnic diversity is important determinant public access to public services in the region. In addition, the level of literate; capability of rural population, access to public information and remote areas impact on local access to the public service. Gilsing (2007) suggest that cooperation among governments in the field of policy that complicated, and the national government had to admit that the position of local governments in the structure of local government also, very complicated. For that a strong desire to form local government that is effective approach policy needs an integrated and adjustment policies and it requires local optimal for setting policies

To build cooperation among government required presence a strong central government considering local capacity in each levels of government (Wilson, 2006 and Smith, 2008).

Wright (1988) identify five aspect in intergovernmental cooperation;

(1) transcendence of constitutionally recognized patterns of governmental involvement to include varieties of relationships; (2) a human element or the activities and attitudes of persons occupying official positions in the units of government under consideration; (3) relationships between officials involved in their continuous contacts and exchanges of information and views; (4) involvement of all types of public officials—legislators, judges, administrators—at different levels of government as potential or actual participants in decision-making processes; and (5) a policy dimension, involving interactions of actors across boundaries surrounding the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of policy.

Cooperation not only occur between public sector, with public but can also take place between public and private sector (Savas in Muhammad Yunus, 2006 and Laffin 2007). Cooperation that is performed to gain an advantage or benefit together necessary good communication among all parties and the same understanding against the purpose of conducting cooperation

The mechanism of cooperation among local governments especially cooperative agreements done among local governments initially aimed at 1). Single activities, 2).With regard service than facilities,3).Does not have a permanent,4).Asstand by new provision when itexercised on certain conditions and,5).Allowed/approved by a legislative body (Henry, 2004). Relate to that, there are three forms and methods cooperation between local governments agreement covering; 1. joint service, 2).Intergovernmental service transfer; and 3).Pattern of interlocalism.(Henry 2004)

To minimize the appearance of friction and conflicts between the parties in cooperation, Layman (2003) suggests three principles in cooperation between the Government, namely:

First, there is a common loyalty to the Republic as a whole. This means that all spheres are committed to securing the well being of all the people in the country and, to that end, must provide effective, transparent, accountable and coherent government for the Republic as a whole. This is the object of cooperative government. **Second**, the distinctiveness of each sphere must be safeguarded. This entails the following: the constitutional status, institutions, powers and functions of each sphere must be respected; a sphere must remain within its constitutional powers; and when exercising those powers, a sphere must not do so in a manner that encroaches on the geographical, functional or institutional integrity of another sphere. **Third**, spheres of government must take concrete steps to realize cooperative government by - fostering friendly relations; assisting and supporting one another; informing one another of, and consulting one another on, matters of common interest; co-ordinating their actions and legislation with one another; adhering to agreed procedures; and avoiding legal proceedings against one another.

According to layman (2003) cooperation among government built on tension between national interests with what becomes the choice jurisdictional in every region good provincial or regency / city to provide public services.

3.2 Educational Goods and Service

The public goodsare those when consumed by a particular individual won't reduce consumption someone else will the goods.A public goods are goods that can not be restricted who the user and as much as possible even somebody does not need to issue cost to get it.The public good is to the general publicso as to from all quarters can enjoy it (Savas, 2000; Trogen, 2005).A goods and services are grouped as goods public if a joint consumption and exclusion (Savas, 2000) while public goods according to trogen (2005) is non-rivarly and non-excludable. Categorizing goods and services education as public goods or as private goods can be used karakteristitik which was formulated by Savas (2000) as follows;

Table 1.A matrix kinds of goods and services by virtue of its characteristics

Characteristic	Easy to exclude	Difficult to exclude
Individual consumption	Individual goods (e.g.: food, clothing, shelter)	Common-pool goods (e.g., fish in the sea)
Joint consumption	Toll goods (e.g., cable TV, telephone, electric power)	Collective goods (e.g., national defense, felons)

Source: E.S. Savas, 2000

Based on these categories, both expressed olahe Savas (2000), as well as advanced by Trogen (2005) as well as described by Rahardjo (2010), the primary education and secondary education can be categorized as public goods and services. Most educational goods and services not included into the category of public goods goods and services education contains the Minimum Service Standards (MSS/SPM).

SPM in the field of education has stipulated by the government based on government regulation number 19 year 2005 about national standard article 2 paragraph 1, which includes; standard the contents of standard process, standard competence graduates, standard educator and workforce, standard facilities and infrastructure, management, standard standard financing, default judgment education.Because SPM education sector was goods and services public then penyediaannya be obligations and responsibilities a public institution or the government (Ndraha, 2011). SPM education sector it has become an indicator that goods and services education included as public goods that availability and become the responsibility of public institution, its financing in this case is a country.

IV. Research Methods

This research is extrapolating by using approach grounded theory which aims to develop theories appropriate and explain the field of subjects (Strauss and Corbin in Shodiq & Imam muttaqien, 2003; Strauss and Corbin in McNabb, 2002).The technique of collecting data used in this research is the interview, observation and study of documentation.The data used an analysis by the use of grounded theory (Strauss and corbin in Denzin and Lincoln, 1994).

V. Results And Discussion

5.1 The importance of Intergovernmental Cooperation

Decentralization and regional autonomy have apparently perceived and be addressed in variatif by some local governments in indonesia. Autonomy perceived as the momentum to fulfill interests alone without regard to the broader context namely interests and the interests of the country overall other adjacent. Consequently, appear some symptom of negative that disturbs among others home sentiment primordiale, clashes between the regions, the process of corruption, clashes between the inhabitants, the exploitation of natural resources excess, and the appearance of attitude "ego regional" excessive. District or city tend protects all the potential for its own benefit, strictly and shut themselves against district or another city. Negative impact on economic activity in other regions, an area as externalitas, nor anyone noticing it again. Even sentiment arising with the general tendency raised only "prince of the region" who can be civil servants

The appearance of negative symptoms has to be getting serious attention because sooner or later will affect the level of services to the citizens, especially the provision of basic needs (basic need) such as education. To anticipate a symptom of the negative of decentralization and the autonomy of the region, it then the cooperation between local governments into a necessity. The importance of cooperation between local governments in research is focused on three reasons, namely reason administration, political reasons and economic reasons.

5.2 Administration factors

The results of the research indicates that the cooperation among local governments in the implementation of free education in South Sulawesi not able to increase the capacity of the organization of local government that is equivalent and not shown the presence of increasing efficiency and effectiveness of providing goods and services education. This proved that the reason the administration of about the importance of cooperation among local governments in the case is less powerful. Failure substantial occurring in the cooperation between local governments this according to reason administration is not to the issuance of goods and services that it is education, public goods so penyediaanya are mandatory government irrespective of anyone who are in power.

Table2. Education index by Regency/City in Sulawesi Selatan, 2008-2010

Regency/City		2008	2009	2010
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)
01	Gowa	67.3	68.12	69.80
02	Bone	70.3	70.74	71.46
03	Makassar	87.7	88.00	88.56
Sulawesi Selatan		73.8	74.48	75.92
National		78.2	78.88	79.53

Source: Statistics Bureau, Sulawesi Selatan, 2011.

The Data in Table 2 show that there are differences in the Organization of local government capacity to provide service to the community, so that it will lose its effectiveness and efficiency. To that end, cooperation between local governance with a third of the Regency/City governments administratively can be seen from the scope and the object that cooperated.

Based on the research obtained data that scope and components that be cooperated in cooperation among local government in the free education in Sulawesi Selatan: 1). Additional operational school cost; 2). Charges school rules and transportation costs for learners poor in the scholarship; 3). An incentive for teachers and workforce (Article 5 Paragraph 1). Next in article 6 paragraph 2 stipulated that 40% of all financing charged/borne by the government of South Sulawesi and 60% charged / borne by regent/municipal government.

The consequence of the exact scope and the object of the cooperation agreement cooperated by Shafritz & Russel (2005) was the inception of administrative responsibility, about who did what and what resources are used to do. So the urgency of cooperation between local governments in organizing education in South Sulawesi, located on the rule of the parties worked together to increase capacity in providing service to the community. Rights and obligations of the parties in cooperation with the administrative function clearly detailing each of the local authority to resolve what to do (rights and obligations) and with resources were used to complete the work (rights and obligations).

The results of the research indicates still weak reason administration in the cooperation between local governments to convene free education. It is seen in the absence of capacity building, an indicator effectiveness and efficiency of the organization of regional government of providing goods and services in education. Failure build and improve capacity, effectiveness and efficiency of the organization of the local government showed weakness cooperation among local governments that according to Post (2002) has an excess of effectiveness communicate.

Views Post (2002) does not mean falsely or erroneously but the data it indicated that cooperation among local governments are only need a communication that effective, or clearness objects be cooperated, but also needed clarity about whom do what, and with the resources what is used to do that (Shafritz & Russel 2005). This analysis focus to the importance to build and improve capacity, the efficiency and effectiveness organization local governments in providing goods and services education. As far as partnership built it failed to increase the capacity, the efficiency and effectiveness organization the regional governments then considered that these cooperation also failed according to reason administration.

5.3 Political factor

Another fact that is also revealed from the results of this research is that cooperation between regional government also hasn't been able to minimize or prevent conflict. Each region cooperate not feel justice where each party cooperated does not guarantee the sustainability of the handling areas cooperated and has not been able to eliminate the ego of the region. Observations the author (2008-2013) shows that free education in South Sulawesi had exploited political commodity to be the heads of the regions and the regional head of the candidates to achieve his political goal of capturing and maintaining power.

If assessed deeply about the importance of cooperation between local governments based on reason administrative as described above may be known that the reason was born as administrative consequence of the agreement say political parties that cooperate be essential to made in writing and documented.

For that political reasons about the importance of cooperation among local government not less important to review farther. This research not supporting Keban's opinion (2007) suggest that cooperation among regional government can bring benefits political are; 1). The parties who collaborate can reduce or prevent conflict, 2). Each party more feel justice, 3). Each party who collaborate will sustain sustainability handling places be cooperated. 4). By cooperation among regional government can rid of ego regions.

Analysis has an implication that cooperation among the importance of regional government can bring benefits politically. It is in line with findings this research, kind described Patabai Pabokori (Head of Education Agency South Sulawesi Province) who said

The emergence of cooperation among local governments in the implementation of free education in the province of south sulawesi this started than just icons campaign mr. syahrul yasin limpo at the time of submit themselves as governor of South Sulawesi (Interview on June 25th 2012).

So that it was clear that such cooperation is a political programme Syahrul (South Sulawesi Governor), as well as programs that provide basic education administrative services to the public South Sulawesi free of charge. What is done by Governor Syahrul Yasin Limpo, after being selected as the governor is indicated that basic services like education can be provided by the government through the cooperation between the government.

The lack of political legitimacy over cooperation among local government in the free education in South Sulawesi seen in indicators where the venture hasn't reduce or prevent conflict (especially conflict of interest between regional heads), each party not feel justice, each party who collaborate not ensure continued handling places be cooperated even though has Regional Regulation No. 4 / 2009 about the free education in South Sulawesi and cooperation among local government hasn't rid of ego area (as happened in the city of Makassar and Bone)

This fact shows that providing of education goods and services (public goods) continued to be exploited become a thing private (private goods) that had always been issues the political elite and give an advantage to seize and retaining power (political advantage). This is the proof of failure regional head (governor and mayor) in developing a deal politically that primary education is public goods and services (public goods) that provisioning borne entirely by the government (Raharjo, 2010), exclusion and joint consumption (Savas, 2000) or non-rivalry and non-excludable (Troger, 2005). Failure in taking a political decision about the status of education as public goods causing cooperation among local governments in the implementation of free education became a figure "a creature that is curious" that depends on the extent to which can give an advantage in politics.

5.4 Economic factor

The economic growth of South Sulawesi in 2011-2012 as measured from improved growth on the basis of constant prices PDRD became the basis of the importance of cooperation between local governance in order to achieve equitable economic growth area. In the context of decentralization and regional autonomy cooperation between Governments aimed at improving the efficiency and effectiveness of Governments in providing services, community empowerment and economic development is the legislation's mandate as outlined in article 195-197 law number 32 year 2004. Economic aspects of cooperation between local governments is required in order for the economic resources that are owned can be lumped together and utilized for the common good (Keban, 2007)

Pollit and bouckaert (2000), Keban (2007) pointed out some reason economic to the importance he did cooperation among local government of them are; 1).The parties who collaborate may form greater force, 2).The parties who collaborate can reach better higher and, 3).The parties who cooperate to a defenseless.Data the research indicated that the regional governments as happened in Bone regency, and the Makassar city tasted benefits economically this cooperation between government this place but very pragmatic, far from substantif, because does not have a fact two directions.Whereas meant in economic reasons this is spatially two directions, where both parties who collaborate both feel benefits the economically.

The results of the documentation study obtained data like looking at Tables 3 indicate rank the distribution of free education a cooperation of the government of South Sulawesi with the city of Makassar, district Gowa and regent Bone

Tabel 3Budget Transfer of Province to Regent/City

No	Areas (Regency/City)	Budget Transfer to Regency/City	SP2D municipal to School		Amount
			APBD I	APBD II	
01	Gowa	11.869.374.600	11.861.830.950	18.020.976.838	29.882.807.788
02	Bone	16.008.407.160	16.008.407.160	52.552.480	16.060.960.000
03	Makassar	20.934.624.800	20.934.624.800	28.124.390.000	49.059.014.800

Source:Secretariat of Free Education Team, National Education South Sulawesi, 2012

The results of this research also supports the opinion of Muttalib and Khan (1982) who said that the partnership between the various levels of Government will bring benefits such as financial gain. However, in the case of this cooperation, the benefits cannot be achieved to the maximum because of Bone Regency Government and Makassar city did not meet the commitments in the cooperation. This happens because berpisahnya economic reasons are pragmatic and substantif as a result of the failure of the parties in cooperation set economic performance indicators of the existence of this cooperation.

Agranoff (1986) mentions it as a failure in estimating the condition of overload, the ability to estimate things that resulted in in-efficiency and over-regulation. This happens because the cooperation between regional government in organizing a free education not successfully build management intergovernmental (intergovernmental management) or IGM in implementing cooperation among Governments. But according to Agranoff (1986) that IGM is a function of the cooperation between the Government of the region. IGM emphasis on goal achievement process that began since the beginning of the process management and take action together in order to achieve the objectives of cooperation.

5.5 Determinant factors of Intergovernmental Cooperation

5.5.1 Fiscal Capacity Factors

The provision of goods and services (goods and services) is very dependent on financial capability by each area. The limitations of the financial ability of course has consequence of the limited goods and public services that can be accessed by the public. This is in line with the opinion of Dauda (2004) points out that the inability of the Government to provide resources is an important factor that encourages cooperation between the government of the region.

The results of this research show that the contribution of the local revenue (PAD) against the district/city Budget Revenues and Regional Spending (Budget) are still very small. Bone Regency for example, the total Budget Revenues and Regional Spendingis Rp. 1.072.555.172.285, 15; While Local Revenue only Rp. 33.780.847.477,28. This means that contributions to the Budget Revenues and Regional Spendingof local revenue of Bone Regency only amounted to 3.15%. The results of this research also shows that Budgeteach district/city in 2012 has the rest of the budget is large enough, each city of Makassar was Rp. 16.692.385.137; Gowa Regency was Rp. 36.510.574.000; and Bone Regency was Rp. 46.831.880.320.

The result showed that dependence local government against the government especially in terms of finance is very high.But limited the ability of local financial or low-self pad an area not proved has huge against cooperation among regional government of providing goods and services in education.It was proven where pad district gowa also categorized low, only about 80 billion rupiah, but actually still meetits obligation to prepare fund participation of 60% of the total budget free education.Different also to conditions happen in the Makassar city having PAD is too high approximately 340 billion rupiah, but the fact not really fulfill its obligation by providing education funding free of 60% of the total budget required for the free education in Makassar city.

The finding of this research also supports the opinion of Akramov and Asante (2008) suggest that the different levels of income, population density, local institutions, and others impact on the provision of a public service.Besides Akramov and Asante (2008) also found that characteristic of the region, a literate, as levels of capability of rural population, access to public information and remote areas influential on access to public services local.Opinion is congrue again with what put forward by post (2002) who said that propinquity in

geografis and characteristic of culture, social, economic and political cooperation among local affect local governments in menyediakan goods and the service of the public.

5.5.2 Leadership and Political Interest of Mayor

The other factors that become the focus of this research is a factor of leadership and political interests of regional head, also seemed to matter against the cooperation between local governments in the implementation of free education in the province of south sulawesi. The results of the research indicates that the leadership of the feudal, paternalistik and ego of regional head still very thick in the cooperation between local governments to convene free education.

This research result support opinion Agranoff (1986) who said that elite ideologies also affect IGR. This view is understood that can vision and local elite mission impact on every form the relationship between government including cooperation between local governments. Gilsing (2007) suggest that very pemuda national policy influence policy, at a local level either by set agenda and overcome the problems faced by local governments. Explained that responsibilities and interdependence between strong local leaders make policy arena complex interwoven effectively. For it is the communication policy instruments to support local governance and financial optimize wisdom.

Opinion Gilsing (2007) has gained support from Smith (2008) suggest that cooperation between the two tiers of government in which level or higher very determined by the degree of legitimacy of conducted in just. So the process of cooperation among governments lies not in the process is democratic or not, but located on the extent to which this cooperation containing the values of justice for all parties that is mutually cooperate.

Gilsing opinion (2007) and Smith (2008) reinforce the views Wilson (2006) explained that in building the necessary cooperation between the government with strong central consider capacity in each local levels of government. The review Drajat (2010) also seems support expert opinions formerly, that several factors affecting effective cooperation between local governments are subtansi, was a factor and the hierarchy their respective regions.

5.5.3 Culture and structure of local government factors

Results of this study illustrate that bureaucratic culture paternalistik, feudal, nepotism, collusion and corruption as well as the structure is too fat and Parkinsonism is still so apparent in the cooperation among the local government. Government bureaucracy is the area responsible institutions to enforce any policies and operating standards that have been set, do the coordination of program and control every expense (Webb and Wistow in Agranoff, 1986). Therefore the characteristics of bureaucracy is indispensable for trust relationships or trust ties for every actor involved in a cooperation between Government (Agranoff, 1986).

The opinion is in line with the findings of this study that the characteristic of the region's Government bureaucracy can be berpengaruh against cooperation between local governance including the primordial, paternalistic culture is very strong in pemerintahan area of bureaucracy (Bone and GowaRegency), happy culture served from on serving (all levels of local government working together) by applying the maximum pattern or a fat bureaucracy. This is in line with what is expressed by (Hendry, 2004), the characteristics of bureaucracy in Weber (Shafritz and Hyde, 1987) and the bureaucratic politicking seems to have a huge influence on the cooperation between the government of the region.

The emergence of cases of politicking and paternalistic bureaucratic in cooperation between local governance for the organization of free education in the province of South Sulawesi are the result of the failure to form a system that integrated and form a network of organizations (organizational networking), so that it will form a collective and collaborative management mentioned by Agranoff (2003) as the intergovernmental management (IGM).

VI. Conclusion

Based on the discussion by way of the conclusion can be formulated as follows

- 6.1 Reason administration, economic and political reasons is important determinan in cooperation among local government on the organization education service. This means that cooperation between local government in order providing goods and services education must put third that reason as a factor strengthener. The weakness one that reason can cause lack also commitment of parties who working together to fulfill the commitment as where the agreed.
- 6.2 The parties cooperated in organizing regional intergovernmental in provisioning free education can corroborate by considering the factors of regional financial capability, leadership and political interests of the head regions well as culture and bureaucratic structure of government of the region. It explains that in cooperation between local governance in the field of educational services need to apply regulation management and stucture-legal reform. IGM that serves as a regulatory menghedaki management each rule

or decision relating to the importance of cooperation between Governments should be done in conjunction with the reform of the financial system, the legality of leadership and bureaucratic structure.

Reference

- [1]. Supriyono, Bambang. 2010. Sistem Pemerintahan Daerah Berbasis Masyarakat Multikultural. Pidato Pengukuhan Jabatan Guru Besar dalam Bidang Ilmu Sistem Pemerintahan Daerah pada Fakultas Ilmu Administrasi Universitas Brawijaya Malang. FIA-UB. Malang
- [2]. Muluk, Khairul. M.R. 2002. Desentralisasi, Teori, Cakupan dan Elemen. Jurnal Administrasi Negara, Vol.II/2 Maret 2002
- [3]. Agranoff, Robert. 1986. Intergovernmental Management: Human Services Problem-Solving in Six Metropolitan Areas. Albany, N.Y.: State University of New York Press.
- [4]. Firman, T., 2009. Decentralization Reform and Local-Government Proliferation in Indonesia: Towards a Fragmentation of Regional Development. *Review of Urban and Regional Development Studies* 21(2/3), hal. 143-157
- [5]. Laffin, Martin, 2007; *Comparative British Central-Local Relations: Regional Centralism, Governance and Intergovernmental Relations. Public Policy and Administration* SAGE Publications Ltd London, Thousand Oaks, CA and New Delhi. Downloaded from ppa.sagepub.com by Masriadi Patu on October 10, 2010
- [6]. Coon, James A. 2011. Intergovernmental Cooperation. James A Coon Local Governmental Technical Series. www.dos.state.ny.us
- [7]. Paterson, DA. 2008. Intergovernmental Cooperation James A.Coon Local Government Technical Series. Department of State. Lorraine A. Cortes-Vazquez. Secretary of State New York State.
- [8]. Domai, Tjahjanulin., 2009. Implementasi Kebijakan Kerjasama Antar Daerah Dalam Pemanfaatan Sumberdaya Daerah (Studi Kerjasama Antar Daerah dalam Perspektif Sound Governance). Disertasi FIA-Universitas Brawijaya. Malang
- [9]. Warsono, Hardi. 2009. Regionalisasi dan Manajemen Kerjasama Antar Daerah (studi kasus dinamika kerjasama antar daerah yang berdekatan di Jawa Tengah). Ringkasan Disertasi. Program Doktor Ilmu Administrasi Negara. UGM. Yogyakarta
- [10]. Post, Stephanie Shirley. 2002. Local Government Cooperation : The Relationship Between Metropolitan Area Government Geography and Service Provision. Prepared for delivery at the 2002 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, August 29 – September 1, Boston, Massachusetts.
- [11]. Akramov, Kamiljon Tand Asante, Felix. 2008. Decentralization and Local Public Services in Ghana: Do Geography and Ethnic Diversity Matter. Downloaded from jpe.sagepub.com by Masriadi Patu on October 10, 2010
- [12]. Gilsing, Rob. 2007. Intergovernmental Relations And The Effectiveness Of Local Governance: The Case Of Dutch Youth Policy. *International Review of Administrative Sciences* 2007 73: 45. IIAS, SAGE Publications (Los Angeles, London, New Delhi and Singapore) Vol 73(1):45–64 <http://ras.sagepub.com/content/73/1/45>. Downloaded from ras.sagepub.com by Masriadi Patu on October 10, 2010
- [13]. Wilson, Robert H. 2006. Decentralization and Intergovernmental Relations In *Social Policy: A Comparative Perspective of Brazil, Mexico and the US*. Prepared for the Interregional Conference on Social Policy and Welfare Reform University of Texas at Austin. April 20-21, 2006
- [14]. Smith, Jennifer. 2008. Intergovernmental Relations, Legitimacy and the Atlantic Accords. Prepared for the CPSA Meetings Vancouver, June.
- [15]. Wright, Deil S. 1988 *Understanding Intergovernmental Relations*. Belmont, Cal.: Brooks/Cole.
- [16]. Yunus, Muhammad. 2006. Kerjasama Kemitraan Pendidikan Kejuruan (Analisis Implementasi Kebijakan Praktek Industri Dalam Rangka Peningkatan Mutu dan Relevansi Lulusan SMK di Kota Tarakan Provinsi Kalimantan Timur). Disertasi. FIA-UB. Malang
- [17]. Henry, Nicholas. 2004. *Public Administration and Public Affairs*. Ninth Edition. Prentice Hall, New Jersey
- [18]. Layman, Timothy. 2003. Intergovernmental Relations And Service Delivery In South Africa: A Ten Year Review. Final report completed. Commissioned By The Presidency
- [19]. Trogen, Paul, C. 2005. *Theory of Public Goods: dalam Donijo Robbins (ed), 2005. Handbook of Public Sector Economics Part II*. Marcel Dekker/CRC Press LLC. United States of Amerika
- [20]. Savas, E.S. 2000. *Privatization And Public-Private Partnerships*. Clatham House Publishers Seven Bridges Press. LLC New York London
- [21]. Rahardjo, Mudjia. 2010; Pendidikan Bebas Biaya: Sekedar Kampanye atau Komitmen Politik. <http://mudjiarahardjo.uin-malang.ac.id/artikel/137>, Wednesday, 03 March 2010
- [22]. Strauss, Anslern and Corbin, Juliet. 2003. *Basic of Qualitative Research : Grounded Theory Procedures and Techtiques*. (Penerjemah: Muhammad Shodiq & Imam Muttaqien). Pustaka Pelajar. Yogyakarta
- [23]. Denzin, Norman, K. & Yvonna, S. Lincoln (eds). 1994. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*. Sage Publications. International Educational and Professional Publisher. Thousand Oaks, London New Delhi
- [24]. Shafritz, Jay M. dan E.W. Russell. 2005. *Introducing Public Administration*; Fourth Edition. Pearson Education. Inc.
- [25]. Keban, Jeremias, T. 2007. Membangun Kerjasama Antar pemerintah Daerah Dalam Era Otonomi. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan Indonesia*. Jakarta
- [26]. Agustinus, Leo, 2011. Sisi Gelap Otonomi Daerah (Sisi Gelap Desentralisasi di Indonesia Berbanding Era Sentralisasi). Widya Padjadjaran. Bandung
- [27]. Crawford, G. and C. Hartmann. 2008. *Conclusion: Decentralisation – No Shortcut to Development and Peace. Decentralisation in Africa: A Pathway out of Proverty and Conflict?* G. Crawford and C. Hartmann. Amsterdam University Press. Amsterdam
- [28]. Goldsmith, M. 2005. A New Intergovernmentalism? In B.B. Deters and L. Rose (eds). *Comparing Local Governance, Trends and Developments*. Pp 228 – 245. Palgrave: Basingstoke