

Tourism entrepreneurial ecosystem policy model as an effort to improve the welfare of micro, small and medium enterprises

Indien Winarwati¹, Moh, Karim², and Achmad Badarus Syamsi^{2*}

¹Faculty of Law, University of Trunojoyo Madura, Indonesia

²Faculty of Islamic Studies, University of Trunojoyo Madura, Indonesia

Abstract. Ecosystems and good management are needed to make a superior tourist destination, so that later it will lead to the welfare of the community and micro, small and medium enterprises around it. Therefore, an Entrepreneurial Ecosystem policy is needed to develop a superior tourist destination and can improve the economy of the community and small and medium enterprises. The purpose of this study is to identify the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem tourism policy model in increasing the potential and welfare of micro, small and medium enterprises in Pamekasan. This research is descriptive qualitative in nature. The research location was determined purposively, namely in Pamekasan Regency. Primary data sources were obtained directly from the research subjects, in this case the parties related to the village-owned enterprises of tourism objects, namely: Tourism managers, related agencies, the Office of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises Cooperatives and stakeholders. The results of this study indicate that the appropriate policy model is the Political System model which places the policy as the output of the system. This policy model is oriented towards community interest inputs, in this case tourism stakeholders both private and government that support the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem. This research also shows that the entrepreneurial ecosystem is still not well developed in Pamekasan because stakeholders from both the private sector and the government have not synergised to grow and motivate the entrepreneurial ecosystem. Thus, the tourism entrepreneurial ecosystem policy model still needs to be revised and improved in Pamekasan.

1 Introduction

A region can progress and can increase its regional income depending on the extent to which the management of the potential that exists in the area, both the potential in the form of natural resources and human resources. Including Pamekasan regency, a regency located on the island of Madura, has abundant natural resource potential that can generate profits and increase community income. One of the potential managements can be realised by tourism management. There are at least 22 tourist attractions in Pamekasan regency.[1]

The potential of these attractions can increase the income of village communities, if managed by Village-Owned Enterprises (VOE's). Because the purpose of establishing a Village-Owned Enterprise is to provide distribution services managed by the community and the Village Government so that the Village's needs (productive and consumptive) can be achieved.[2] Based on Article 3 of the Minister of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration Regulation No. 4/2015 on the Establishment, Management, and Dissolution of Village-Owned Enterprises, the objectives of establishing Village-Owned Enterprises are: (a) to improve the Village economy; (b) to optimise Village assets for the benefit of the Village's welfare; (c) to

increase community businesses in managing the Village's economic potential; (d) to develop business cooperation plans between Villages and with third parties; (e) to create market opportunities and networks that support the needs of the community's public services; (f) to create employment opportunities; (g) to improve the welfare of the community through improved public services, growth, and equitable distribution of the Village economy; and (h) to increase the income of the Village community and the Village's original income.[3] In Kabupaten Pamekasan, there are 178 villages spread across 11 kecamatan.[4] Of the 178 villages, there are still 43 villages that do not have VOE's.[5]

Village-Owned Enterprises are village business entities whose ownership is submitted by the community and village government to improve the village economy, the establishment of VOE's is determined by the needs and potential of the village.[6] VOE's operates by accommodating community economic activities in an institutional form or company organisation that is professionally managed and based on the potential of the village.[7] Thus, VOE's can manage the potential owned by the village, including in developing and improving MSMEs in the area. Village-Owned Enterprises (VOEs) have significant potential to improve village economies and support MSMEs. VOEs

* Corresponding author: bsyams85@gmail.com

contribute to the development and sustainability of MSMEs in the tourism sector, for example by facilitating access to markets and promoting local products. VOEs often serve as platforms to promote and sell local products and services, helping MSMEs reach a wider customer base. By showcasing local handicrafts, food and experiences, VOEs can attract tourists and encourage them to buy from MSMEs.

MSMEs have proven to have an important role in the national economy, where MSMEs are able to survive in various situations, so MSMEs are often considered the backbone of the economy globally. MSMEs have a huge role in the national economy because they are proven to be able to reduce unemployment, increase community income, increase gross production, and become an example of entrepreneurship development. In addition, MSMEs are also proven to be able to increase people's per capita income, so this means that MSMEs are very influential in poverty alleviation. This research is limited to the legality of Village-Owned Enterprises and their business units in the form of MSMEs. It is hoped that further research can discuss regulations and the role of the Regional and Central Governments in the development and resolution of problems faced by Village-Owned Enterprises and MSMEs as their business units.[8] In Pamekasan Regency, there are 47,000 MSMEs.[9]

Tourism objects managed by VOE's will have an impact on increasing MSMEs in the area.[10] Tourists who come to visit will automatically buy and bring home souvenirs. The souvenirs brought are products from local MSMEs.[11]

Based on the author's previous research entitled "Collaborative Governance-Based Halal Tourism Development Strategy in Madura", the author concludes that the role of stakeholders, especially agencies related to tourism development such as the tourism office and the village community empowerment office, has coordinated to develop tourist attractions based on their main tasks and functions. However, there is still no specific form of policy from the relevant agencies regarding collaboration to develop tourism, especially collaboration with the private sector. The legal development strategy in accordance with the context in Madura based on collaborative governance is in the form of Memorandum of Understanding or agreement between stakeholders consisting of government and private elements. although the articles or paragraphs that regulate cooperation agreements between VOE's and stakeholders in government regulation number 11 of 2021 on VOE's are still too general, so more specific and technical regulations are needed.[12]

The urgency of the agreement between VOEs and investors in the development of tourist destinations can be seen philosophically, which means that the justice of the parties who will cooperate in the tourism business can be realised by agreement. From a legal point of view, it shows that the legal security of the parties involved in the business of developing tourist destinations can be achieved through an agreement. Economically, it shows that an agreement can facilitate

doing business, especially in the development of tourist destinations.[13]

In addition to the MoU, to improve and strengthen the management of VOE's and its impact on MSMEs, a good ecosystem is needed. Ecosystems began to be associated with the business world with the birth of the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem, which states that business is not born from an empty space and in business there is an interaction relationship that occurs between actors with an interest in the growth of the company.[14] Entrepreneurial Ecosystem is a relatively new concept, which has several definitions and no common definition. The concept of Entrepreneurial Ecosystem emphasises how entrepreneurship is made possible by a comprehensive set of resources and actors that have an important role to play in the whole entrepreneurial action. Entrepreneurial Ecosystem is realised that most of the time it seems to be local where an ecosystem will differ from region to region, entrepreneurial ecosystem is often tied to social contacts or local mobility in a region that other regions do not necessarily have.[15] The Entrepreneurial Ecosystem approach ultimately proves to be an appropriate framework for assessing smart tourism destinations as they promote more sustainable urban development. This study advances the theoretical framework of smart tourism by empirically demonstrating the importance of entrepreneurship.[16]

Based on the explanation above, the author is interested in studying this matter with the title Entrepreneurial Ecosystem Policy Model of VOE's Tourism Management in Increasing the Potential of MSMEs in Pamekasan.

The study contributes to the theoretical understanding of entrepreneurial ecosystems by proposing a model that integrates the political system framework. This model emphasises the interaction between different stakeholders and environmental forces, and provides a structured approach to analysing how policies can be formulated to support entrepreneurship in tourism.

The research also provides actionable policy recommendations aimed at improving the entrepreneurial ecosystem in Pamekasan. These recommendations can guide local governments and stakeholders in designing and implementing strategies that promote collaboration, enhance capacity building and support MSMEs in the tourism sector.

The research provides empirical insights into the unique challenges and opportunities faced by local entrepreneurs in the tourism sector. This context-specific analysis enriches the understanding of how local conditions influence the entrepreneurial ecosystem and can serve as a case study for similar regions.

2 Methods

This research is descriptive qualitative with the type of empirical legal research or also called socio-legal research, which focuses on the operation of law in society, namely when regulations have been implemented and immediately mingle with society.[17]

In the context of this research is a policy related to village-owned enterprises managing tourism and MSMEs. The approaches used in this research are statute approach, case approach, and conceptual approach. The statute approach involves analysing existing laws, regulations and policies that govern VOEs and MSMEs. Researchers will review relevant legislation at both regional and central government levels to understand the legal framework that supports or hinders the development of these enterprises. The aim is to identify gaps, inconsistencies or areas for reform that could improve the entrepreneurial ecosystem. The case approach focuses on specific cases or examples of VOEs and MSMEs in action. This approach allows for an in-depth understanding of the real-world application of laws and policies, and provides insights into best practices and lessons learned that can inform future policy development. The conceptual approach involves exploring theoretical frameworks and concepts related to entrepreneurship, governance and economic development. Researchers will examine existing literature on entrepreneurial ecosystems, collaborative governance, and the role of local and central governments in supporting enterprises. By applying these concepts, the research can develop a comprehensive understanding of how VOEs and MSMEs fit into broader economic theories and practices, and how these frameworks can guide policy recommendations for improving the entrepreneurial environment. This is due to the prescriptive characteristics of the law, namely the coherence between regulations on VOE's and MSMEs with VOE's and MSMEs themselves.[18] The data collection technique used is conducting in-depth interviews as a data collection tool in addition to literature studies. The selection criteria for participants in the in-depth interviews for the research on Village-Owned Enterprises (VOEs) and Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises (MSMEs) can be detailed as follows: Participants must have a direct link to the tourism sector and the management of VOEs and MSMEs; Participants were selected from a variety of roles and sectors, including government agencies, private sector stakeholders and community representatives; Participants should have sufficient experience or expertise in their respective fields to provide informed insights into the challenges and opportunities faced by VOEs and MSMEs.

3 Results and discussion

3.1 Policy

According to Anderson, the definition of public policy is the policies developed by government agencies and officials.[19] Thomas R. Dye explains that public policy is everything that the government chooses to do or not do; if the government chooses to do something, then there must be an objective, and public policy must include all government actions, not just a statement of the wishes of the government or its officials. Moreover,

something that the government does not do is also part of state policy. This is because 'something not done' by the government will have as much influence as 'something done' by the government.[20]

Public policies are decisions made by public authorities that are binding on many people at a strategic or policy level. As a decision that binds the public, public policy must be made by political authorities, i.e. those who receive a mandate from the public or the people, usually through an electoral process, to act on behalf of the people. Public policy is implemented by the state administration, which is run by the government bureaucracy. The main focus of public policy in a modern state is public service, which is everything the state can do to maintain or improve the quality of life of the people. It balances the role of the state, which has a duty to provide public services, with the right to levy taxes and charges. On the other hand, it balances the different groups in society with different interests and to achieve the mandate of the Constitution.[21]

Anderson says that there are 5 things related to public policy, namely: 1. Goal or goal-oriented activities should be the main concern of random behaviour or sudden events. 2. Policy is a pattern or model of government officials' actions regarding their discretionary decisions separately. 3. Policies should include what governments actually do, not what they intend to do, or what they say they will do. 4. The form of policy can be positive or negative. 5. Public policy in its positive form is based on legal provisions and authority.[19]

3.2 Public policy formulation model

The following is an explanation of several types of public policy formulation models.

3.2.1 Rational-comprehensive model

This model is based on economic theory or the concept of an economic man. The comprehensive rational model emphasises rational decision making by capitalising on the comprehensiveness of information and decision-making expertise. In this model, the concept of rationality is the same as the concept of efficiency. Therefore, it can be said that a rational policy is a highly efficient policy, where the ratio between the value sacrificed is positive and higher than other alternatives. The result of the policy-making process is a rational decision, which is a decision that can achieve a goal most effectively.[22]

3.2.2 Incrementalism theory

This model views public policy as a continuation of past government activities with only minor modifications. The incremental model is a criticism and improvement of the comprehensive rational model. Incremental decisions are characterised as remedial policymaking and are more directed at solving concrete social problems that exist now, not to improve the achievement

of social goals in the future. Lindblom, then concludes that because decision-making is always overwhelmed by the limitations of time, skills and costs, it is impossible to analyse all values and objectives of society, all policy alternatives and their consequences, assess the benefit-cost ratio in detail, arrange the ranking of policy alternatives based on the benefit-cost ratio and then make decisions according to relevant information. Recognising the limitations of the decision maker, the incremental model only focuses on modifying the existing policy slightly.[23]

3.2.3 Mixed scanning theory

The proponent of this theory is an organisational sociologist named Amitai Etzioni. He came up with a hybrid decision-making model that combines the good elements of the rational-comprehensive and incremental models, which is referred to as the mixed scanning model. This approach utilises the previous two approaches flexibly, depending on the problem and situation. In some cases the rational-comprehensive approach will be applied when "high coverage scanning" is required. And in other cases when "truncated scanning" (detailed observation of a particular target) is required, the incremental approach takes its turn. This compromise mixed-scanning approach has made us aware of the very important fact that decisions are not the same or different in both scope and impact, so different decision-making approaches are required for different types of decisions.[24]

3.2.4 Institutional Model

This model is a traditional model in the process of making public policy. The focus or centre of attention of this model lies on the organisational structure of the government. This is because political activities are centred on government institutions such as the legislature, executive, judiciary both at the central, regional and local governments. In this regard, state policy is authoritatively formulated and implemented in these government institutions. There is a strong relationship between public policy and government institutions, this is because a policy cannot be a public policy if it is not formulated, endorsed and implemented by government institutions. Traditionally, the institutional model usually describes the organisational structure, tasks and functions of organisational officials. Unfortunately, it does not analyse the relationship between these institutions and public policy. However, we must be careful in assessing the relationship between government institutions and public policy, because the assumption that if the institutional structure changes, public policy will also change is not always true. This is because both government institutions and public policy are influenced by environmental forces (external factors).[25]

3.2.5 The mass-elite model

This model views state administrators not as servants of the people but rather as "small established groups" (the establishment). The elite group in charge of making and implementing policy is portrayed in this model as a group capable of acting/doing in an environment characterised by mass apathy, information confusion, so that the masses become more passive. Public policy flows from top to bottom, namely from the elite to the masses. Elite groups that have power and elite values are different from the masses. Thus public policy is the embodiment of the main desires and values of the ruling elite. Because public policy is determined by the elite group, government officials are merely implementers of the policies set by the elite, while the demands of the masses (non-elites) are not considered. Thus elitism means that public policy does not so much reflect the wishes of the people as the wishes of the elite. This causes changes and updates to public policy to run slowly.[26]

3.2.6 Group model

This model adheres to the group understanding of David B. Truman states that interaction between groups is a political reality. Individuals who have the same interests bind both formally and informally into interest groups that can propose and impose their interests on the government. The group model sees public policy as an equilibrium that is achieved as a result of group struggle. To maintain this balance, the task / role of the political system is to mediate conflicts that occur between these groups. Influential interest groups are expected to influence public policy. The level of influence of the interest group is determined by the number of members, wealth, strength, and goodness of the organisation, its leadership, close relationship with decision makers, internal cohesion of its members and so on. Political activity (inclusive of public policy formulation) is seen by this model as the result of a group struggle, so that public policy makers continuously respond to the pressures exerted by these groups (pressure groups) by bargaining, negotiating, and compromising on competing demands from influential groups.[27]

3.2.7 Political system model

Paine and Naumen offer a model of the policy formulation process that refers to the system model. This model is lifted from David Easton's description in "The political system". This model is based on the concepts of information theory (inputs, outputs and feedback) and views public policy as a response of a political system to environmental forces (social, political, economic, cultural, geographic, and so on) around it. Thus, public policy is seen by this model as the result (output) of the political system.[28]

3.3 Entrepreneurial ecosystem concept

The term entrepreneurial ecosystem was first introduced by Daniel Isenberg at the Institute of International European Affairs in 2011 who stated that in general, the entrepreneurial ecosystem consists of easy access to markets, the presence of labour, access to capital, support systems (such as mentors, advisors and incubators), policies and regulations, infrastructure, education and training systems, support from Higher Education Institutions and also socio-cultural support. Isenberg states that the structure in the entrepreneurial ecosystem includes 6 (six) pillars that form it, as presented in Figure 2. 1 of the entrepreneurial ecosystem domain, namely (i) cultural conduciveness (tolerance for risk and failure, positive outlook on entrepreneurship); (ii) supportive leadership and policymaking such as incentives, rules/regulations, supportive policies and leadership (regulatory incentives, support from public institutions); (iii) adequate financing (microcredit, venture capital, etc.); (iv) human capital (education and training institutions, human resource skills); (v) market availability and its ability to absorb products; and (vi) support from other institutions and infrastructure (legal, accounting, computerisation and IT and entrepreneurship groups).[29]

Stam also defines "entrepreneurial ecosystem as a set of actors in an interdependent business environment and processes organised in such a way as to enable the action of entrepreneurial/partnership relationships".[15]

Based on the entrepreneurial ecosystem categories identified above by Isenberg, the seven pillars of the entrepreneurial ecosystem can be categorised as follows:

1. The cultural or inspirational pillar, including the components of social norms and the dissemination of best practices that can play a role. Entrepreneurial culture is underpinned by social norms prevailing in the environment, such as failure, acceptance or tolerance of risk and mistakes, and a culture of innovation and creativity. In addition, success stories reporting entrepreneurship in the media and social networks, and entrepreneurial reputation are also elements of corporate culture.
2. The human resources (HR) pillar. A well-educated workforce and an entrepreneurial parent or family background are among the factors that make up the entrepreneurial ecosystem.
3. The third pillar is education, including the education and training component. Education at various levels (elementary, junior high, and above) can shape aptitude and basic skills. Technology and vocational education are also important elements of the entrepreneurial ecosystem.
4. The fourth pillar of funding. The ability to raise funds in different ways, depending on the level of development and type of entrepreneurship, is crucial in determining the establishment and sustainability of a venture. Funds required include MSME loans, investment co-operation, venture capital, capital markets and other forms of funding.

5. Market pillars include consumer networks and responsiveness. A dynamic entrepreneurial ecosystem requires a hospitable market for new products, as evidenced by the presence of sensitive consumers who are willing to adapt to the purchase of new products. The existence of an extensive integrated production and marketing network is also an important factor in the sustainability of an enterprise.
6. A political pillar that embraces government policy and leadership. Government institutions, including legislation, policies and programmes, budgets and incentives, can form the external carrying capacity that enables the development of entrepreneurial ecosystems. Ideally, government policies should be complemented by competent leaders or leadership, characterised by commitment and determination to support business strategy and entrepreneurship development.
7. Support pillar that contains supporting components related to the role of non-governmental, academic, and infrastructure. The role of non-governmental organisations is necessary to encourage entrepreneurship, knowledge transfer and network development among entrepreneurs. The role of specialised institutions both in terms of advocacy and legal assistance, accounting, banking and associations is very helpful especially in the development of entrepreneurship. Physical infrastructure support such as telecommunications, transport, logistics, energy and water are also key factors in determining a healthy and dynamic entrepreneurial ecosystem.[29]

3.4 Village-owned enterprises

Village-owned enterprises are legal entities, and obtain their legal entity status after being issued an electronic registration certificate from the minister who organises government affairs in the field of law and human rights. This means that village-owned enterprises are legal subjects that can exercise rights and obligations as other legal entities such as limited liability companies and cooperatives. However, there are differences with other legal entities when it comes to agreements, namely the approval of the implementation of the business carried out by the village-owned business entity must be approved by the advisor and supervisor or the Village Consultative Assembly in accordance with its authority as stipulated in the Articles of Association of the village-owned business entity [30].

The implementation of cooperation between village-owned enterprises is regulated by Government Regulation Number 11 of 2021 concerning village-owned enterprises. The PP provides space for village-owned enterprises to develop business activities by cooperating with other parties. Cooperation carried out by village-owned enterprises is not only carried out with government institutions but also private institutions with legal status in Indonesia. The form of cooperation

carried out can be in the form of business and non-business cooperation.

Forms of business cooperation between village-owned enterprises and other parties in developing businesses have provisions that must be mutually beneficial and protect the interests of the village and the village community. In addition, business cooperation is prohibited from providing any obligations or achievements to make village assets as collateral for the non-performance of these achievements.

The existence of the seven pillars of the entrepreneurial ecosystem in Pamekasan district already exists, but their functions and roles are still not optimal. This happens because among the seven pillars there is still no good system, no synergy and lack of coordination. In general, the pillars can be categorised into two, namely the public and private sectors. The public sector consists of government elements while the private sector consists of private parties.

3.5 Tourism entrepreneurial ecosystem policy model as an effort to improve the welfare of micro, small and medium enterprises

The Entrepreneurial Ecosystem aims for the independence of village communities supported by many stakeholders both government and private. Its existence has an impact on the welfare of the community around tourist destinations managed by Village-owned enterprises although it is still not significant because the synergy between pillars has not run optimally.

After reviewing and analysing, the pillars in the concept of entrepreneurial ecosystem are in accordance with the concept or formula of "The political system" policy model. The concept, proposed by Paine and Naumen, offers a model of the policy formulation process that refers to the system model. This model is based on the concepts of information theory (inputs, withinputs, outputs and feedback) and views public policy as the response of a political system to environmental forces (social, political, economic, cultural, geographic, and so on) that exist around it. The seven pillars of the entrepreneurial ecosystem are: 1. The first pillar, culture or source of inspiration, is a pillar that in Madura identically comes from 2. The pillar of human resources (HR). 3. The third pillar of education, 4. The fourth pillar of funding. 5. The market pillar including consumer networks and responsiveness. 6. The political pillar that embraces government policy and leadership. Government institutions, including legislation. 7. A support pillar that includes supporting components related to the role of non-governmental, academic, and infrastructure. Some of these seven pillars have existed for a long time in Madura, this can be seen from the concept of bhuppa'-bhabhu'-ghuru-rato in Madura. The cultural pillar or source of information, of course, has generally existed with the concept of bhuppa'-bhabhu'-ghuru-rato. The pillar of education and the pillar of support can be shown from the existence of ghuru or kyai, who take part in the world of education and science, as well as figures whose suggestions are

considered as input for policy makers. Rato or king or can be interpreted as an executive, a government that implements policies. While the other pillars are also indirectly bound by the concept of bhuppa'-bhabhu'-ghuru-rato, because it is a guide for Madurese people.

The environmental forces referred to are the pillars contained in the concept of entrepreneurial ecosystem, so the most appropriate policy model related to the entrepreneurial ecosystem is the political system model. Thus, public policy is seen by this model as an output of the political system.

3.5.1 Main findings of this research

The main findings of the research on "Tourism Entrepreneurial Ecosystem Policy Model as an Effort to Improve the Welfare of Micro, Small and Medium Enterprises" are as follows: First, Policy Model Identification. This study identifies the policy system model as the most appropriate framework for developing policies to support the entrepreneurial ecosystem in Pamekasan. This model emphasises the importance of community interest input and synergy between different stakeholders, including private and government, to promote entrepreneurship. second, Undeveloped Ecosystem. This research shows that the entrepreneurship ecosystem in Pamekasan is not well developed. The lack of synergy and collaboration among stakeholders hinders the growth and motivation necessary for a thriving entrepreneurial environment.

Third, tourism potential. Pamekasan has significant tourism potential, with at least 22 tourist attractions that can increase community income if managed effectively. The establishment of Village-Owned Enterprises is critical to harnessing this potential, as they are designed to meet the productive and consumption needs of village communities.

Fourth, the need for policy review. The study concludes that the current policy model of the tourism entrepreneurship ecosystem needs to be reviewed and improved to better support micro, small and medium enterprises. This includes improving collaboration between stakeholders and ensuring that policies are aligned with community needs.

The findings highlight the critical role of effective policy and stakeholder collaboration in improving the well-being of local communities through tourism and entrepreneurship.

3.5.2 Comparison with other research

The research on the Tourism Entrepreneurial Ecosystem Policy Model can be compared to other research in the field of entrepreneurial ecosystems and tourism development in several ways: first, the focus on stakeholder synergy. Similar to other studies, this research emphasises the importance of collaboration between stakeholders. For example, Isenberg (2011) discusses the role of different actors in creating a supportive entrepreneurial ecosystem, highlighting those synergies between the public and private sectors

are crucial to fostering entrepreneurship. Pamekasan's study is consistent with this by identifying the lack of synergy as a barrier to the development of an entrepreneurial ecosystem. Second, the application of the Political System model. The application of the political system model in this study is consistent with the findings of other studies that advocate a policy framework that takes into account community input and environmental factors. For example, Paine and Naumes (1975) suggested that public policy should be seen as a response to environmental forces, which is consistent with the findings of Pamekasan's study that the business ecosystem should adapt to local conditions and stakeholder needs.

Third, tourism as an economic driver. The focus of this study on tourism as a means of improving the welfare of micro, small and medium enterprises is supported by other literature. Research has shown that tourism can make a significant contribution to local economies, particularly in areas rich in natural and cultural resources. Research has documented successful cases where tourism management has led to increased incomes for local communities, similar to the potential identified in Pamekasan. fourth, implementation challenges. Challenges in implementing an effective entrepreneurial ecosystem, such as lack of coordination and inadequate policy frameworks, are common themes in another research. For example, research in various regions has highlighted that without proper governance and stakeholder engagement, even well-designed policies may fail to deliver the desired results. This is reflected in the Pamekasan study's conclusion that current policies need to be revised to better support local businesses.

The findings of the Pamekasan study are consistent with broader trends in entrepreneurial ecosystem research, particularly regarding the importance of stakeholder collaboration, the application of appropriate policy models, and the role of tourism in economic development. However, the study also highlights specific local challenges that require tailored solutions.

3.5.3 Implications and explanation of findings

The implications and explanations of the findings of the Tourism Entrepreneurial Ecosystem Policy Model study are crucial for policy formulation and practical application in the context of Pamekasan and similar regions. The main implications and explanations are presented below:

The implications of the findings of the "Policy Model of Tourism Entrepreneurial Ecosystem" study include the following: First, policy development. The identification of the policy system model as the most appropriate framework for entrepreneurial ecosystems suggests that policy makers should focus on inclusive policy making that takes into account the inputs and needs of local communities. This approach can lead to more effective tourism management and support for micro, small and medium enterprises (MSMEs).

Second, stakeholder engagement. The findings highlighted the need for greater collaboration between stakeholders, including government agencies, private sector actors and community members. This implies that entrepreneurship initiatives should prioritise building networks and partnerships that facilitate communication and resource sharing.

Third, capacity building. This study shows that the entrepreneurial ecosystem in Pamekasan is underdeveloped due to a lack of synergy among stakeholders. This suggests the need for capacity building programmes to equip local entrepreneurs and community members with the necessary skills and knowledge to effectively engage in tourism and business activities.

Fourth, tourism management strategies. The potential of tourism to improve community well-being underscores the importance of developing strategic management plans for local tourist attractions. This includes promoting sustainable tourism practices that benefit both the economy and the environment to ensure long-term sustainability.

Fifth, future research directions. This study paves the way for further research into specific strategies that can enhance stakeholder synergies and improve entrepreneurial ecosystems. Future research could explore best practices from other regions and how they can be adapted to the local context of Pamekasan.

The explanation of the findings of the study on the "Policy Model of Tourism Entrepreneurial Ecosystem" is as follows: First, the Political System Model. The choice of the Political System Model is explained by its focus on the interaction between different environmental forces (social, economic, political) and the policy outcomes that result from these interactions. The model helps to understand how local conditions and stakeholder input shape tourism policies and entrepreneurial initiatives.

Second, an underdeveloped ecosystem. The lack of synergy between stakeholders is due to a lack of coordination and communication. This finding explains why the entrepreneurial ecosystem has not reached its full potential, as effective collaboration is essential to leverage resources and expertise to support local businesses.

Third, tourism potential. The study explains that Pamekasan's rich natural and cultural resources offer significant opportunities for tourism development. However, without effective management by Village-Owned Enterprises, these opportunities may not generate economic benefits for the community.

Fourth, the need for policy review. The conclusion that current policies need to be revised is based on the observation that the existing framework does not adequately address the unique challenges faced by local entrepreneurs. This finding underscores the importance of adaptive policy making that responds to the needs of communities and the evolving entrepreneurial landscape.

In summary, the implications of these findings point to the need for a comprehensive policy approach that promotes collaboration, capacity building and strategic

tourism management. The explanations provided clarify the reasons for the current state of the entrepreneurial ecosystem in Pamekasan and highlight the importance of tailor-made solutions to improve community well-being through tourism and entrepreneurship.

The limitations of the tourism entrepreneurial ecosystem policy model are: first, generalisability. While the study provides valuable insights into the Pamekasan context, the findings may not be easily generalisable to other regions with different socio-economic and cultural conditions. The unique characteristics of Pamekasan may limit the applicability of the findings to other areas. second, potential bias. The reliance on stakeholder interviews may introduce bias, as participants may have their own interests and perspectives that influence their responses. This could affect the objectivity of the data collected and the conclusions drawn from it.

4 Conclusion

The entrepreneurial ecosystem is still not well established in Pamekasan because the stakeholders from both the private sector and the government have not synergised to foster and motivate the entrepreneurial ecosystem.

The policy model that is appropriate to the context of Pamekasan is the Political System Model: policy as system output. This policy model is suitable for the Pamekasan area because it is oriented towards community interest inputs, in this case tourism stakeholders both private and government that support the Entrepreneurial Ecosystem.

This research can be continued by examining the synergy strategy of the private sector and the government in improving the entrepreneurship ecosystem.

References

1. <https://tempatwisataseru.com/tempat-wisata-di-pamekasan-madura/>, (2023)
2. Gunanto D.A., Arianti E.Y., Kushartono F., Darwanto, *The Development of Independent Villages Through the Management of Village-Owned Enterprises*, J. Econ. Business Dynamics, **13**, 1, 67–81, (2016)
3. Permendesa PDFTT No. 4 of 2015 on the Establishment, Management, and Dissolution of Village-Owned Enterprises, (2015)
4. <https://pamekasankab.go.id/kondisi/geografis#:~:text=Kabupaten%20Pamekasan%20terbagi%20secara%20administratif,2%20kelurahan%20dan%20%20desa.>, (2023)
5. <https://datadesacenter.dpmd.jatimprov.go.id/publik/bumdes/kabupaten-none.>, (2023)
6. Zunaidah A., Askafi A., Daroini E., *Peran Usaha Bumdes Berbasis Pertanian Dalam Upaya Meningkatkan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat*, Manaj. Agribisnis J. Agribisnis, **21**, 1, 47–57, (2021)
7. Febryani N.H., Nurmalia R., Lesmana I.M.I., Ulantari N.K.W., Dewi D.P.Y.P., Rizky, *Keberadaan Badan Usaha Milik Desa (Bumdes) Sebagai Penguatan Ekonomi Desa Abiantuwung*, J. Ilm. Akunt. dan Humanika, **8**, 1, 95–103, (2019)
8. Eggers F., *Masters of disasters? Challenges and Opportunities for SMEs in Times of Crisis*, J. Bus. Res., **116**, 199–208, (2020)
9. <https://maduraindepth.com/diskop-catat-ada-47-ribu-pelaku-umkm-di-pamekasan#:~:text=Diskop%20Catat%20Ada%2047%20Ribu%20Pelaku%20UMKM%20di%20Pamekasan.>, (2023)
10. Sinarwati N.K., Dewi L.G.K., Sugiantara F., Wasuka B.P., Safitri S.A., *Model for Increasing Micro and Small Enterprises Performance through Optimizing the Role of BUMDes*, JIA (Jurnal Ilm. Akuntansi), **6**, 2, 379–393, (2021)
11. Akmal S., Zulfikri A., Sasmito P., Al-Hidayat R., *Tourist Perception of the Quality of MSME Products and Services in Tourist Destinations*, West Sci. J. Econ. Entrep., **1**, 5, 175–181, (2023)
12. Winarwati I., Karim M., *Strategi Pengembangan Wisata Halal Berbasis Collaborative Governance di Madura*, (2022)
13. Syamsi A.B., Sulistiyono A., Purwadi H., *Agreements Between Village-Owned Enterprises (VOEs) Managing Tourist Destinations and Investors; Legal Review*, in Proceedings of the International Conference On Law, Economic & Good Governance (IC-LAW 2023), 354–358, (2023), doi: 10.2991/978-2-38476-218-7_59
14. Purbasari N.R., Wijaya C., *The entrepreneurial ecosystem as a network-rich system: a systematic mapping study*, Acad. Entrep. J., **25**, 2, (2019)
15. Stam, Spiegel, *Entrepreneurial Ecosystems, Discussion Paper Series Utrecht School of Economics*, Tjalling Koopmans Research Institute, (2016)
16. Eichelberger S., Peters M., Pikkemaat B., Chan C.-S., *Entrepreneurial ecosystems in smart cities for tourism development: From stakeholder perceptions to regional tourism policy implications*, J. Hosp. Tour. Manag., **45**, 319–329, (2020), doi: 10.1016/j.jhtm.2020.06.011
17. Cohen M.L., Olson K., *Legal Research*, St. Paul. Minn. West Publishing Co., (1992)
18. Marzuki P.M., *Penelitian Hukum*, Cet. 12, Jakarta: Prenada Media, (2016)
19. Anderson J.E., *Public Policymaking: An Introduction*, 6th ed., Belmont: Wadsworth Cengage Learning, (2006)
20. Dye T.R., *Understanding Public Policy*, Englewood Cliffs, N. J.: Prentice-Hall, (1981)
21. Taufik M., *Hukum Kebijakan Publik: Teori dan Praksis*, Yogyakarta: Tanah Air Beta, (2022)

22. Carter J.L., Wu X., *An Examination of the Rational Model in Business Education in the Greater Bay Area (Guangdong, Hong Kong, and Macau) for Curriculum Revision and Development Aimed at Improving Graduates' Employability Potential*, *Asian J. Univ. Educ.*, **16**, 2, 141–165, (2020)
23. Desmarais B.A., *Punctuated equilibrium or incrementalism in policymaking: What we can and cannot learn from the distribution of policy changes*, *Res. Polit.*, **6**, 3, (2019), doi: 10.1177/2053168019871399
24. Mulyana Y., Huraerah A., Martiawan R., *MODEL KEBIJAKAN MIX SCANNING DALAM PENGEMBANGAN PARIWISATA CIANJUR SELATAN*, *Din. Gov. J. ILMU Adm. NEGARA*, **9**, 2, (2019)
25. Healey P., *An institutional model of the development process*, *J. Prop. Res.*, **9**, 1, 33–44, (1992), doi: 10.1080/09599919208724049
26. Shim J., Gherghina S., *Measuring the mass-elite preference congruence: findings from a meta-analysis and introduction to the symposium*, *Eur Polit Sci*, **19**, 509–527, (2020), doi: 10.1057/s41304-020-00273-y
27. LaVaque-Manty M., Bentley, *Truman, and the Study of Groups*, *Annu. Rev. Polit. Sci.*, **9**, (2006)
28. Paine F.T., Naumes W., *Organizational strategy & policy*, Saunders, (1975)
29. Isenberg D., *The Entrepreneurship Ecosystems Strategy as a New Paradigm of Economics Policy: Principle for Cultivating Entrepreneurship*, Babson Global, (2011)
30. Government of Indonesia, *Village Owned Enterprises*, (2021)