

DEMOCRACY, TRUST AND COMMITMENT IN IN COLLABORATIVE MANAGEMENT: INDONESIA'S COLONIAL HERITAGE CEMETERY

Agus Subianto, Hang Tuah University

Desiderius Chandra Kurniawan, Indonesian Society for Quality Concerns

Suraji, Hang Tuah University

ABSTRACT

This research discusses the concept of collaborative advantage as a new approach in analyzing collaborative management involving government, universities and the private sector in the development of sustainable colonial heritage graves. This research was conducted in Surabaya using the method of observation and direct interviews with the actors involved in policy makers. The results show that the concept of collaborative advantage reveals that collaborative management is for the sustainable development of colonial heritage in De Begraafplaats. Researcher Soerabaja, Indonesia as tourism and conservation is characterized by differences in the values, interests, goals and priorities of stakeholders, therefore in the early stages of cooperation failed, because the implementation of aspects of democracy and equality, power and trust, commitment was not optimal. In advocating for consistent stakeholder engagement in the development of cultural heritage cemeteries for conservation and tourism, there is a need for collaborative institutional innovation, collaborative excellence as a new approach to the sustainable development of colonial cultural heritage.

Keywords: Stakeholder, Collaborative Management, Heritage Cemetery, Conservation, Tourism

INTRODUCTION

Cemetery is part of the cultural heritage of the community, in the form of tombs and monuments containing historical and architectural values (Guiamet et al., 2011). In recent years, heritage tourism is an interesting and trendy form of tourism (Timothy & Schmidt, 2010), as historic and cultural tourist attractions it must be preserved, including tangible assets and intangible assets (ICOMOS, 1999). Inheritance is a debated attraction of strength; that historic and cultural areas need to be preserved for sustainable tourism (Herbert, 1995; Newby, 1995; Van der Borg, Costa & Gotti, 1996).

The controversy over inheritance management to be developed as tourism or conservation, has become an important issue, especially the contradiction between the controversy over heritage conservation and heritage tourism in various developing countries (Degang & Wanzhen 2007; Labadi 2017; Nuryanti, 1996; Oevermann & Mieg 2015; Paul & Roy 2017; Timothy, 2014; Zhang, Fyall & Zheng, 2015). Heritage sites have a lot of social and political significance (McIntosh, 1999; Rugg, 2000a; Richards, 1995), in the relationship between heritage cemetery site and tourism (Ashworth, 2000; Garrod & Fyall, 2000; Prentice,

1993). However, its development has been facing various challenges, destruction, theft (Rainville, 2009), and always faces pressure from changes in environmental use (Burg, 2008). Therefore, dialogue, collaboration networks, and collaboration with various stakeholders need to be developed (Aas, Ladkin & Fletcher, 2005; Mordue, 2007).

Research on heritage cemetery is an interesting issue, because it is an important part of the city's social, cultural and historical development (Babić & Bingula, 2015; Dow et al., 2005; Isaac & Çakmak, 2014; Mytum, 2010a; Orvell, 2012a; Reimers, 1999a; Guiametab et al., 2012). Cemetery, built as tangible evidence of historical and cultural developments through the style and design of the tomb (Chaumont et al., 2013), conservation needs to be done in implementing initiatives and policies to respond to the various demands and expectations of the goals, as well as the utilization and decentralization of grave management (Ciolfi & Petrelli, 2015a).

In recent years, partnership research, collaboration, and joint management with local communities, has become a trend approach in tourism development. For this reason, the sustainability of collaboration between stakeholders needs to be institutionalized, especially to build trust, so that it contributes to improving the economic level of the community. Local development in the regions for innovation based on collaboration between stakeholders and public-private partnerships is still underdeveloped, because it faces many challenges (Valentina, Marius-Răzvan & Stroe (2015). Differences in values, interests, goals and priorities among stakeholders, can lead to conflicts in inheritance management and become a challenge for management and conservation (Nyaupane, 2009).

Surabaya city have heritage cemetery sites for the Europeans and Orientals, the Dutch East Indies era, De Begraafplaats Peneleh Soerabaja, in the city center, but as a legacy of high historical value, have not been managed optimally. This cemetery is interesting, not only because the buildings and monuments have architecture in the 19th century, but there are more than 100 important figures from various nations in the colonial era, including the Foreign East (Vreemde Oosterlingen) (table 1), which has 5117 tomb buildings, including the tombs Pieter Merkus as Governor General of the Dutch East Indies (period 1841-1844) who had historical relations with Indonesia, but was not buried in the Netherlands or in Batavia (now: Jakarta) the seat of the Dutch East Indies government, precisely in Surabaya.

Today, the De Begraafplaats Peneleh Soerabaja heritage site has been more than one and a half centuries, developed through collaborative management between the Surabaya City Government, Academics from the Department of Architecture, Faculty of Design and Regional Planning (PDPW), Surabaya Sepuluh Nopember Institute of Technology (ITS), and Leon Bok (Bureau of Funeraire Adviezen) on behalf of the Heritage of the Dutch Cultural Service. However, the initial collaborative management has not shown optimal results. Based on these problems, this research was carried out to further investigate, collaborative management for the development of colonial era heritage cemetery.

Topics of this research paper are published: First, to provide insight through the concept of collaborative excellence as a new approach to analyzing collaborative management involving government, universities and the private sector, in the development of sustainable colonial heritage graves.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses a qualitative approach (Schwandt, Denzin & Lincoln, 1994), through a systematic search and collection process, all data is obtained from the field, based on interviews, field notes and documents, recorded archives, and data from online media, then analyzed through three stages: (1) data reduction, (2) data presentation, and (3) decision making and data verification stages (Huberman & Miles, 2009) Field data collection is done through observation direct and interviews with key informants Supported by secondary data in the discussion to answer key questions raised in this study We conducted 10 interviews including: Surabaya City Government Officials, Surabaya City DPRD Members, Anthropologists from Airlangga University, Urban Planning Experts and Architects from Surabaya Sepuluh November Institute (ITS), Surabaya City Cultural Heritage Observer, Heirs' Family.

RESEARCH ANALYSIS

The analysis in this study uses the Collaborative Excellence Theory of Huxham and Vangen (1996) as a conceptual framework for investigating collaboration between Government, Private and Higher Education.

Code	Interviews
I-PK: 1 to 4	Interview with City Government Officials from:
	City Development Planning Board
	Department of culture and tourism
	Department of Cleanliness and Green Open Space (DKRTH)
	Regional People's Representative Assembly
I-PT: 1 to 2	Interview with Academics from:
	Department of Architecture, Faculty of Design and Regional Planning (FDPW), Institute of Technology Sepuluh November (ITS) Surabaya
	Head of the Anthropology Museum, Airlangga University
	Interview with the Society from:
I-M: 1 to 4	Von FABER Surabaya
	Observers of cultural and heritage objects, Surabaya Cemetery Owner Heirs

Case Study of De Begraafplaats Peneleh Soerabaja

De Begraafplaats Penereh Soerabaja Heritage Cemetery, known as Peneleh Cemetery, was inaugurated on December 1, 1847, has 5117 tomb buildings. Merkus (Governor General of the Dutch East Indies, period 1841-1844), Sefridus van der Tuuk (President van de Raad van Justitie), PJB de Perez (Vice President van de Raad van Indie), Resident Pietermaat (1790-1848)

and others (table 2), including Foreign Eastern nationals (Vreemde Oosterlingen) are foreign nationals who are residents of the Dutch East Indies, who hold passports from non-European foreign countries (table 3) (“Cultureelerfgoedpeneleh.Pdf” n.d.).

Name	Forename	Position	Day of Funeral	Nationality
Andreas	Johannes	Shipmaster & ship-wright of this port	1851.04.22	Engels
Tuuk van der	Sefridus	President van de Raad van Justitie	1853.06.15	Nederland
Perez de	P.J.B.	Vice president van de Raad van Indie	1859.03.16	Nederland
James	Lloyd	Kopersmid Ned. Ind. Stoomvaart Mij.	1885.12.26	Engels
Archibald	Black	Kapitein van de bark Zephyros	1866.09.17	Duits
Auten Thomas	William	Ship Captain	1889.07.29	German
Berg van den	Johannes Zacharias	President der Weesen boedelkamer	1901.10.17	Nederland
Jacob Heinrich	Jepsen	Echtgenote van Sayo Takano	1910.04.14	Japans

Source: Processed by author, 2017 based on the data-peneleh-dodenakkers.nl

Nationality	Occupation	Number of Citizens
Japans		31
Belgisch		4
Amerikaans	U.S. consular agent	1
Armeens	Hoffotograaf van H.M. Koningin Wilhelmina der Nederlanden	5
Canadees		1
Chinees		8
Chinese		1
Duits	Waterschout, Kapitein van de SS Ban Yong Seng, Kapitein van de bark Zephyros	24
Engels	Shipmaster & ship-wright of this port	11
Frans		6
Inlands		76

Inlandse		1
Italiaans		4
Italie		1
Joods		1
Luxemburg		1
Noors		2
Oostenrijk		1
Pruisen		1
Schots		5
Tsjeschisch		1
Zwitser		4
Without State Information		1376
Total		1566

Source: Processed by author, 2017 based on the data-peneleh-dodenakkers.nl

Heritage cemetery, covering an area of 4.5 ha, built on 26 February 1846 overseen by a Dutch engineer Geil, located at the south of the city of Surabaya, not far from Kali Mas, in Kampung Peneleh (“Cultureelerfgoedpeneleh.Pdf” n.d.), as the quote below:

“This cemetery was built since the Dutch East Indies era, a wall that surrounds as high as 2.5 meters.

This original wall is sturdy and strong, no change since it was first built. After managed by DKP that changed only the entrance. The entrance was at the end of the road facing north” (I-PK-1).

This heritage cemetery, from the historical and architectural aspects of the building is an interesting site and has a high historical value (I-PT-1) and determined as a heritage site based on Surabaya Mayor Decree Number: 188.45/004/402.1.04/ 998, part of 163 objects of building and / or environmental heritage in sequence number 94 are registered in the form of Peneleh Village, including Peneleh Village and Peneleh Cemetery (figure 1 & 2) (I-PK-2).



**FIGURE 1
PENELEH VILLAGE**



FIGURE 2
PENELEH CEMETERY

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

In the collaborative development of the Peneleh Cemetery heritage site involved three parties, including 3 parties each representing the Government: Surabaya City Government (Culture and Tourism Office/Disbudpar), DKRTH and the City Development Planning Agency/Bappeko); Higher Education: Institute of Technology Sepuluh November Surabaya (ITS) (Department of Architecture, FDPW), and Leon Bok (Funeraire Adviezen Bureau) on behalf of the Dutch Ministry of Cultural Heritage, Ministry of Education, Culture and Science, which conducted activities in the form of workshops in 2011, 2012 and 2013 (“Cultureelerfgoedpeneleh.Pdf” n.d.).

Peneleh cemetery is a graveyard that has been inactive from funeral activities since 1954, but the current condition of management is still limited to the maintenance of cleanliness of the heritage cemetery and the environment and maintain orderliness of visitors (I-PK-3), as well as being utilized by the community on the pilgrimage of heirs from abroad (I-M-1), pre-wedding photos, history lovers community activities, observation of architecture practitioners and research from universities and related institutions (I-PT-2), and some grave heirs hope that the grave remains cared for and maintained (I-M-2). Religious communities who regularly visit also want and expect the government to preserve the Peneleh Cemetery, because, after all, Peneleh Cemetery is part of Indonesian history (I-M-3). Observers of the history and culture of the City of Surabaya said that the Peneleh cemetery if treated properly will become a heritage tourism object (I-M-4).

The City Government of Surabaya has implemented a concrete step towards Peneleh cemetery, but its form is still limited to maintain the cleanliness of the environment from the use of wild and perfecting the administration of grave data (I-PK-4), as the quote below:

“Register data has been improved: grave number, block, deceased's name, first name, date buried and has been online, to facilitate the heirs family. The Peneleh Cemetery register is stored in the Surabaya Museum, as a historical archive”.

Analysis of collaborative management of the Peneleh Heritage Cemetery site in a Collaborative perspective (Huxham & Vangen, 1996) showed that the interests of the Surabaya City Government focus on the development of historical tourism destinations, involving relevant regional government organizations (OPD), while the Department of Architecture of FDPW ITS Surabaya, has an interest in maintaining the sustainability of heritage conservation sites as a

source of architectural education in buildings, to increase the capacity of architectural and regional planning institutions . As for Leon Bok as a private party from the Netherlands, its involvement in preserving historical heritage sites, focusing on updating the database, and developing a network (table 4). The results of the 2011 workshop gave recommendations including establishing a foundation that was partly funded by the Dutch to preserve Peneleh, therefore the establishment of a limited organization was needed to manage the cemetery and to carry out some repairs to the tomb monument. Exploration of the community around Peneleh cemetery showed a strong desire from the surrounding villages to be used to expand markets, recreation areas, and other activities. In addition, the cemetery can be used for shortcuts to other areas("Cultureelerfgoedpeneleh.Pdf" n.d.).

Collaborative management in the perspective of Huxham & Vangen (1996) The failure of collaborative management of the heirloom tomb site, because the stakeholders involved in developing the management of the De Begraafplaats heritage site Soelabaja Peneleh towards tourism and conservation have not been optimal, but the parties involved in collaborative management still have the will to continue collaboration, as recommended by workshop results (2011) ("Cultureelerfgoedpeneleh.Pdf" nd). The findings of this study reveal that the failure factor of collaboration is the application of aspects of Democracy and Equality, Power and Trust. Thus, innovation is needed in collaborative management of heirloom burial sites by optimizing aspects of Democracy and equality, Power and Trust, and commitment.

CONCLUSION

The findings of this study reveal that the failure factor of collaboration is the application of Democracy and equality, Power and Trust, and Determination commitment and stamina aspects as in the perspective of Huxham & Vangen (1996) is not optimal, namely stakeholder related to the heritage sites involved that are still limited, as the findings of (Petrova & Hristov, 2016) that the private sector is still limited.

Thus, innovation is needed in collaborative management of heritage cemetery sites by optimizing the aspects of Democracy and equality, Power and Trust, and Determination commitment and stamina (Huxham & Vangen, 1996), as the findings of Näser & Tully (2019). Balanzátegui Moreno (2018) that in revitalizing historical heritage cemetery sites need to use a collaborative approach, and in the development of heritage tourism it is necessary to consider the interdependence of the relationship between heritage conservation and tourism, therefore the role of collaboration and stakeholder management is needed (Aas, Ladkin & Fletcher, 2004).

IMPLICATION

This study offers the concept of collaborative excellence (Huxham & Vangen 1996) as a new approach to analyzing the challenges of collaborative management for the development of sustainable colonial cultural heritage. By applying the concept of developing collaborative advantage in the case of collaborative management of the burial of colonial heritage in De Begraafplaats, Peneleh Soerabaja in Indonesia, we draw three conclusions of the concept of collaborative excellence revealing that collaborative management for the development of sustainable colonial heritage in De Begraafplaats Peneleh Soerabaja, Indonesia as tourism and conservation, marked by differences in values, interests, goals, and priorities (Nyaupane, 2009)

of the stakeholders, therefore in the early stages of the collaboration it failed, due to suboptimal implementation of aspects of Democracy and equality, Power and Trust, and commitment determination and stamina in stakeholder involvement.

With this, the case of De Begraafplaats Peneleh Soerabaja shows that the lack of breadth of stakeholders is involved in the collaborative development of colonial heritage sites. Inheritance must be seen more than just the representation of ancient architecture and historic buildings in the Old Tomb, therefore the physical and management dimensions must be improved through stakeholder collaboration so that it can help stakeholders realize their collective goals.

AUTHORS CONTRIBUTION

We are grateful to all people who contributed to this work. We especially thank Fahmi, SantoinDe Begraafplaats Peneleh Soerabaja, Bambang DKP Kota Surabaya, etc. The wishes of all individuals who wished to remain anonymous were fully respected. A full list of all the source material is provided in the Supplementary material. The work was funded by LSM ISQc (Indonesian Society for Quality Concern), Desiderius Chandra Kurniawan, Suraji, Dewi Casmiwati, Lutfi Rohman, analyzed information the paper.

REFERENCES

- Aas, C., Adele L., & John F. (2005). "Stakeholder collaboration and heritage management." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 32(1), 28–48.
- Ackerman, L. (2014). "The evolution of heritage management: Thinking beyond site boundaries and buffer zones." *Public Archaeology*, 13, 113–122.
- Agranoff, R., & Michael Mc. (2004). *Collaborative public management: New strategies for local governments*. Georgetown university press.
- Ahebwa, W.M., John P.A., & Jockey B.N. (2016). "Bridging community livelihoods and cultural conservation through tourism: Case Study of Kabaka Heritage Trail in Uganda." *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 16(2): 103–15.
- Angella, F., & Frank M.G. (2009). "Tale of two cities' collaborative tourism marketing: Towards a theory of destination stakeholder assessment." *Tourism Management*, 30(3), 429–440.
- Ansell, C., & Alison G. (2008). "Collaborative governance in theory and practice." *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–71.
- "Architecture ITS." n.d. Accessed November 19, 2017.
- Ashley, K.S., Mohamed, S.E., Michael M., & Helen M. (2015). "Assessing stakeholders' perspectives towards the conservation of the built heritage of suakin, sudan." *International Journal of Heritage Studies*, 21(7), 674–97.
- Ashworth, G.J. (2000). "Heritage, tourism and places: A Review." *Tourism Recreation Research*, 25(1), 19–29.
- Babić, Darko., & Mihaela B. (2015). "Interpretation at special places: Mirogoj cemetery." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 188, 186–192.
- Bernbom, G., Joan L., & Fynnette E. (1999). "Working together: New collaborations among information professionals." *Cause/Effect*, 22(2), 6–9.
- Bornhorst, T.J.R., Brent R., & Lorn S. (2010). "Determinants of tourism success for dmos & destinations: An empirical examination of stakeholders' perspectives." *Tourism Management*, 31(5), 572–89.
- Bramwell, B., & Angela S. (1999). "Collaboration in local tourism policymaking." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2), 392–415.
- Bill B., & Angela S. (1999b). "Collaboration in local tourism policymaking." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2), 392–415.
- Brokensha, P., & Hans G. (1992). *Cultural tourism in australia*. Australian Government Publishing Service (AGPS).

- Burg, S.B. (2008). "‘From troubled ground to common ground’: The locust grove african-american cemetery restoration project: A Case Study of Service-Learning and Community History." *The Public Historian*, 30(2), 51–82.
- Byrd, E.T. (2007). "Stakeholders in sustainable tourism development and their roles: Applying stakeholder theory to sustainable tourism development." *Tourism Review*, 62(2), 6–13.
- Erick, T.B. 2007. "Stakeholders in sustainable tourism development and their roles: Applying stakeholder theory to sustainable tourism development." *Tourism Review*, 62(2), 6–13.
- Ciolfi, L., & Daniela P. (2015). "Studying a community of volunteers at a historic cemetery to inspire interaction concepts , 139–48.
- Luigina, C., & Daniela, P. (2015b). "Walking and designing with cultural heritage volunteers." *Interactions*, 23(1), 46–51.
- Luigina, C., & Daniela, P. (2015c). "Walking and designing with cultural heritage volunteers." *Interactions*, 23(1), 46–51.
- Clackson, A. (2011). "Conflict and cooperation in international relations." University of hullelecturer. "cultureelergoedpeneleh.pdf." n.d. Accessed March 12, 2018.
- Degang, W., & Sun W. (2007). "Systematic contradiction between heritage conservation and tourism development: Cleaning the temple and cemetery of confucius and the kong family mansion in qufu." *Chinese Journal of Population Resources and Environment*, 5(1), 84–90.
- Dow, S., Jaemin L., Christopher O., Blair M., Jay D.B., & Maribeth G. (2005). "Exploring spatial narratives and mixed reality experiences in oakland cemetery." In proceedings of the 2005 acm sigchi international conference on advances in computer entertainment technology, 51–60. ACM.
- Dredge, D. (2006). "Policy networks and the local organisation of tourism." *Tourism Management*, 27(2), 269–80.
- Dianne, D. (2006b). "Policy networks and the local organisation of tourism." *Tourism management*, 27(2), 269–80.
- Etlin, R.A. (1984). "Père lachaise and the garden cemetery." *The Journal of Garden History*, 4(3), 211–22.
- Richard, A.E. (1984b). "Père lachaise and the garden cemetery." *The Journal of Garden History*, 4(3), 211–22.
- Etzkowitz, H., & Loet, L. (2000). "The dynamics of innovation: from national systems and ‘mode 2’ to a triple helix of university–industry–government relations." *Research Policy*, 29(2), 109–23.
- Ferri, P., & Luca Z. (2017). "Partnerships for heritage conservation: Evidence from the archeological site of herculaneum." *Journal of Management & Governance*, 21(1), 1–25.
- Ford, Robert C, Youcheng W., & Alex V. (2012). "Power asymmetries in tourism distribution networks." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 39(2), 755–79.
- Frew, E.A., & Robin N.S. (1995). "Industrial tourism: the experience and the motivation to visit." In , 88. *Bureau of Tourism Research*.
- Garrod, B., & Alan F. (2000). "Managing heritage tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 27(3), 682–708.
- Getz, D., & Tazim B.J. (1994). "The environment-community symbiosis: A Case for Collaborative Tourism Planning." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 2(3), 152–73.
- Gray, B. (2008). "Enhancing trans disciplinary research through collaborative leadership." *American Journal of Preventive Medicine*, 35(2), S124–32.
- Gray, B., & Donna J.W. (1991). "Collaborative alliances: Moving from practice to theory." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 27(1), 3–22.
- Hall, Michael C. (1999). "Rethinking collaboration and partnership: A public policy perspective." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism* 7 (3–4), 274–89.
- Herbert, D.T. (1995). *Heritage, tourism and society*. Burns & Oates.
- Huxham, C., & Siv, V. (1996). "Working together: Key themes in the management of relationships between public and non-profit organizations." *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 9(7), 5–17.
- Isaac, R.K., & Erdinç, Ç. (2014). "Understanding visitor’s motivation at sites of death and disaster: The case of former transit camp westerbork, the netherlands." *Current Issues in Tourism*, 17(2), 164–179.
- Jamal, T.B., & Donald G. (1995). "Collaboration theory and community tourism planning." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 22(1), 186–204.
- Julia, H. (1997). "Museums and touristic expectations." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 24(1), 23–40.
- Keban, Y.T. (2009). "Kerjasama antar pemerintah daerah dalam era otonomi: Isu strategis, bentuk, dan prinsip." ilmu administrasi negara fisipol UGM.
- Kebudayaan, D., & Pariwisata. (2009). "Undang-undang nomor 10 tahun 2009 tentang kepariwisataan." Departemen kebudayaan dan pariwisata republik indonesia, Jakarta.

- Khalaf, R.W. (2015). "The reconciliation of heritage conservation and development: The success of criteria in guiding the design and assessment of contemporary interventions in historic places." *International Journal of Architectural Research: ArchNet-IJAR*, 9(1), 77–92.
- Labadi, S. (2017). "UNESCO, World heritage, and sustainable development: *International Discourses and Local Impacts*." In *Collision or Collaboration*, 45–60. Springer.
- Limerick, D., & Bert C. (1993). *Managing the new organisation: A Blueprint for Networks and Strategic Alliances*.
- Magee, R., & Audrey, G. 2015. "Heritage site management: From dark tourism to transformative service experience?" *The Service Industries Journal* 35 (15–16), 898–917.
- McComb, E.J, Stephen, B., & Karla B. (2017). "Stakeholder collaboration: A means to the success of rural tourism destinations? a critical evaluation of the existence of stakeholder collaboration within the mounes, Northern ireland." *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 17(3), 286–97.
- Mytum, H. (2010). "Ways of writing in post-medieval and historical archaeology: Introducing biography." *Post-Medieval Archaeology*, 44(2), 237–54.
- Harold, M. (2010). "Ways of writing in post-medieval and historical archaeology: Introducing biography." *Post-Medieval Archaeology*, 44(2), 237–54.
- Nasirahmadi, A., Hensel, O., Edwards, S.A., & Sturm, B. (2017). "A new approach for categorizing pig lying behaviour based on a delaunay triangulation method." *Animal*, 11(1), 131–39.
- Newby, H. (1995). "The national trust: The next hundred years."
- Nolan, M.L., & Sidney N. (1992). "Religious sites as tourism attractions in europe." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 19(1), 68–78.
- Nuryanti, W. (1996). "Heritage and postmodern tourism." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(2), 249–260.
- Oevermann, H., & Harald M. (2015). "Exploring urban transformations: Synchronic discourse analysis in the field of heritage conservation and urban development." *Journal of Urban Regeneration & Renewal*, 9(1), 54–64.
- Orvell, M. (2012). *The death and life of main street: Small towns in american memory, space, and community*. UNC Press Books.
- Paul, S.Kr., & Souvanic R. (2017). "Tourism-based heritage conservation in murshidabad: An appraisal." *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 12(2), 139–54.
- Petrova, P., & Dean H. (2016). "Collaborative management and planning of urban heritage tourism: Public sector perspective." *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 18(1): 1–9.
- Pjerotić, L., Miško R., & Tripković-Marković, A. (2016). "Stakeholder coloboration in tourism destination planning—the case of montenegro." *Economics*, 4(1), 119–36.
- Prentice, R. (1993). *Tourism and heritage attractions*. Routledge.
- Prezenza, A., & Maria C. (2010). "Analysing tourism stakeholders networks." *Tourism Review*, 65(4), 17–30.
- Rainville, L. (2009). "Protecting our shared heritage in african-american cemeteries." *Journal of Field Archaeology*, 34(2), 196–206.
- Ramses, A.M., & Bowo F. (2009). "Kerja sama antar daerah: Format pengaturan dan pengorganisasian."
- Reimers, E. (1999). "Death and identity: Graves and funerals as cultural communication." *Mortality*, 4(2), 147–66.
- Renn, O. (2015). "Stakeholder and public involvement in risk governance." *International Journal of Disaster Risk Science*, 6(1), 8–20.
- Rivero, L. (2017). "Cultural management in the national palace of mexico: Use and heritage conservation." *Ge-Conservación/Conservação*, 1(11), 5.
- Robinson, M. (1999). "Collaboration and cultural consent: refocusing sustainable tourism." *Journal of Sustainable Tourism*, 7(3–4), 379–97.
- Rugg, J. (2000a). "Defining the place of burial: What makes a cemetery a cemetery?" *Mortality*, 5(3), 259–275.
- (2010). "The Victorian cemetery".
- Sautter, E.T., & Brigit L. (1999). "Managing stakeholders a tourism planning model." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 26(2), 312–28.
- Setyagung, E.H, Ummu, H., Irna, A., Corinthias, P.M.S., & Tomohisa, I, (2013). "Preserving cultural heritage: The harmony between art idealism, commercialization, and triple-helix collaboration." commercialization, and triple-helix collaboration.
- Simo, G., & Angela L.B. (2007). "The role of nonprofits in disaster response: An expanded model of cross-sector collaboration." *Public Administration Review*, 67(s1): 125–42.
- Simons, M.S. (1996). "Protection of heritage sites simons actions." *Tourism and Hospitality Research: Australian and International Perspectives*, 519–34.
- "Surabaya, P., Makam, B., Stichting, D.Nl." n.d. Accessed November 19, 2017.

- Thomson, Ann.M., & James L.P. (2006). "Collaboration processes: inside the black box." *Public Administration Review*, 66(s1), 20–32.
- Timothy, D.J. (2014). "Contemporary cultural heritage and tourism: Development issues and emerging trends." *Public Archaeology*, 13(1–3), 30–47.
- Valentina, V., Surugiu, M.R., & Andreea, S. (2015). "Innovative valuing of the cultural heritage assets. Economic implication on local employability, small entrepreneurship development and social inclusion." *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 188, 16–26.
- Van, D.B., Jan, P.C., & Giuseppe G. (1996). "Tourism in european heritage cities." *Annals of Tourism Research*, 23(2), 306–21.
- Vicente, R., Sergio, L., Tiago, M.F., Serena, C., & Mendes, J.A.R. (2018). "Cultural heritage monuments and historical buildings: conservation works and structural retrofitting." *In strengthening and retrofitting of existing structures*, 25–57. Springer.
- Waayers, D., Diane, L., & David, N. (2012). "Exploring the nature of stakeholder collaboration: A case study of marine turtle tourism in the ningaloo region, western australia." *Current Issues in Tourism*, 15(7), 673–92.
- Wood, D.J., & Barbara, G. (1991). "Toward a comprehensive theory of collaboration." *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science*, 27(2), 139–62.
- Yin, R.K. (2009). *Case Study Research, Design & Methods (4th Ed)*.
- Zach, F. (2012). "Partners and innovation in american destination marketing organizations." *Journal of Travel Research*, 51(4), 412–25.
- Zhang, C., Alan, F., & Yanfen, Z. (2015). "Heritage and tourism conflict within world heritage sites in china: A Longitudinal study." *Current Issues in Tourism*, 18(2), 110–136.
- Zhong, X., & Xiangming, C. (2017). "Demolition, rehabilitation, and conservation: Heritage in shanghai's urban regeneration, 1990–2015." *Journal of Architecture and Urbanism*, 41(2), 82–91.
- Chaumont, M., Tribouillard, L., Subsol, G., Courtade, F., Pasquet, J., & Derras, M. (2013). Automatic localization of tombs in aerial imagery: Application to the digital archiving of cemetery heritage. *In 2013 i (DigitalHeritage)*, 1, 657-660
- Timothy, D.J., & Schmidt, K.R. (2010). Personal heritage and return visits to american colonies in mexico. *Tourism Review International*, 14(4), 179-188.
- Magee, R., & Gilmore, A. (2015). Heritage site management: From dark tourism to transformative service experience?, *The Service Industries Journal*, 35(15-16), 898-917.
- Guiamet, P.S., Rosato, V., de Saravia, S.G., García, A.M., & Moreno, D. A. (2012). Biofouling of crypts of historical and architectural interest at La Plata Cemetery (Argentina). *Journal of Cultural Heritage*, 13(3), 339-344.
- Näser, C., & Tully, G. (2019). Dialogues in the making: Collaborative archaeology in Sudan. *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage*, 1-17.
- Schwandt, T.A., Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, Y.S. (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Londres, Ed: Denzin & Lincoln.
- Huberman, A.M., & Miles, M.B. (2009). Manajemen data dan metode analisis. *Handbook of Qualitative Research*.
- Nyaupane, G.P. (2009). Heritage complexity and tourism: The case of Lumbini, Nepal. *Journal of Heritage Tourism*, 4(2), 157-172
- Australia ICOMOS. (1999). The burra charter -The Australian ICOMOS charter for places of cultural significance. Australia: Australia ICOMOS Incorporated. Barton (2000). Accounting for public heritage facilities- assets or liabilities of the government. *Auditing and Accountability Journal*, 13(2), 219-35
- Petrova, P., & Hristov, D. (2016). Collaborative management and planning of urban heritage tourism: Public sector perspective. *International Journal of Tourism Research*, 18(1), 1-9.
- Näser, C., & Tully, G. (2019). Dialogues in the making: Collaborative archaeology in Sudan. *Journal of Community Archaeology & Heritage*, 1-17.
- Schwandt, T.A., Denzin, N.K., & Lincoln, YS. (1994). *Handbook of qualitative research*. Londres, Ed: Denzin & Lincoln.
- Valentina, V., Marius-Răzvan, S., & Stroe, A. (2015). Innovative valuing of the cultural heritage assets. Economic implication on local employability, small entrepreneurship development and social inclusion. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 188, 16-26.
- Balanzátegui, M.D.C. (2018). Collaborative archaeology to revitalize an afro-Ecuadorian cemetery. *Journal of African Diaspora Archaeology and Heritage*, 7(1), 42-69.

