

## Intisari

Studi ini hendak mengkaji sekaligus mengkritisi teori *collaborative governance*. Ide dasar teori ini adalah membangun kolaborasi dari konsensus antar *stakeholder*. Ada kegagalan ketika mencermati gagasan ini. Agaknya, teori ini terlalu normatif dan menyepelekan watak politis para aktor yang terlibat. Membayangkan bahwa para aktor yang terlibat akan puas dengan konsensus di forum-forum formal. Padahal, konsensus yang terbangun dalam forum-forum tersebut, tidak lantas menghilangkan *self-interest* nya masing-masing aktor. Akibat cara berfikir yang normatif dan ketidakpekaan atas motif tersembunyi itulah membuat teori ini tidak bisa menjelaskan “*mengapa para aktor beragam kepentingan mau berkolaborasi ?*”. Patut diduga ada tujuan tersembunyi yang ingin dicapai melalui transaksi kepentingan. Untuk menjawab pertanyaan di atas, medium pembuktiannya adalah kolaborasi penyelamatan hutan (REDD+).

Untuk mengungkap motif para aktor berkolaborasi, riset ini akan dikawal dengan pendekatan *rational choice*. Dalam mazhab *rational choice*, individu akan tetap mengupayakan bagaimana mendapat keuntungan yang maksimal. Tindakan mereka dipengaruhi oleh preferensi atau pilihan-pilihan terbaik yang tersedia. Memaksimalkan manfaat yang diperoleh adalah tujuan utamanya. Dalam konteks kolaborasi misalnya, para individu memilih berkolaborasi karena bisa jadi itulah pilihan terbaik yang akan mendatangkan keuntungan yang berlipat bagi mereka. Sebuah tindakan yang wajar ketika aksi kolaborasi tersebut menyangkut urusan publik. Merujuk pendapat Olson dalam Logika Aksi Kolektif, justru tidak rasional bagi individu untuk terlibat secara sukarela dalam sebuah kerjasama demi kepentingan publik. Keinginan yang wajar ketika individu menginginkan imbalan yang lebih atas kesediaannya bergabung dalam sebuah aksi kolektif. Sementara, penggunaan metode studi kasus dinilai tepat, karena kajian yang diteliti adalah kasus tunggal. Sehingga akan mendapatkan jawaban yang elaboratif dan mendalam.

Berdasarkan kasus REDD+ di Berau, yang mendorong para *stakeholder* berkolaborasi adalah adanya motif ekonomi. Untuk mendapatkan imbalan sekaligus memaksimalkan keuntungan pribadi (*self-interest*) yang dilakukan adalah dengan membuat konsensus “diam-diam” (informal). Di dalam konsensus informal itulah terjadi “transaksi kepentingan” yang tujuannya adalah saling bersiasat demi mendapatkan keuntungan yang lebih besar. Sehingga, dalam kolaborasi dengan ragam kepentingan, relasi transaksional adalah keniscayaan. Karena dengan cara bertransaksi itulah mereka dapat “bekerjasama”. Dengan demikian, *self-interest* dan relasi transaksional akan selalu ada dalam bentuk-bentuk kolaborasi. Kehadiran keduanya adalah hal yang wajar. Namun, ketika kepentingan pribadi (motif ekonomi) mengambil alih kepentingan bersama (agenda resmi), itu akan berdampak pada kolaborasi. Akibatnya adalah *quasi-kolaborasi*: refleksi relasi transaksional dimana kepentingan pribadi menjadi tujuan utama.

**(Kata Kunci: Collaborative Governance, REDD+, Rational Choice Theory).**

## Abstract

This study would explain and criticize collaborative governance theory. The basic idea of this theory was developing collaboration from consensus among stakeholders. There was something treacherous when the researcher investigated this objective. Presumably, this theory was too normative and undervalued the character of politicians who tortuous in developing the theory. Imagine that the actors who involved would be satisfied with the consensus in formal forums. Whereas, the consensus, which were built in those forums, did not eliminate the self-interest of each character. The effect of the way of normative thinking and insensitivity on ulterior motives, would brand this theory could not explain “why did the actors with vary of interests want to do collaboration?” It could be suspected that there was a hidden purpose, which was needed to be reached through transaction of interest. To answer the question above, the researcher applied excluding forest collaboration as the evidence medium (REDD+)

To prove the motive of the collaborations actors, this study would be guided by rational choice approach. Rational choice approach, every individual would struggle to afford how to gain the high benefit. Their acts were affected by the best existing preferences or the best existing selections. Maximizing the benefit that had been gained from the collaboration was the major destiny. In the context of collaboration, for instance, the individual chose collaboration because it could become the best election that would obtain double benefit for them. An act that was common when the action of the collaboration connected to public business. According to Olson in *Collective Action Logic*, it would not be rational for every individual to get engage voluntarily in cooperation for public interests. Communal longing when individual hope to get more payment as the willingness to be part of the collective action. Temporary, the implementation of the case study method was adjudicated as the correct method, for the reason that the field that was observed was a single case. So as to the case, it would develop the answer, which were elaborative and profound.

Based on the case of REDD+ in Berau, the factor that encourage the stakeholders to do collaboration was economic motive. The goal of their collaboration was to get the payment and maximize their private benefit or self-interest, which were done by creating consensus silently or illegally (informal). In the informal consensus might be happened “transaction-interest”, where it had purpose, the purpose was to get more benefit, they made strategy to mean it. With the intention of collaboration with vary of interests and transactional relations, it was inevitably. Hence, by the way of their transaction, they were able to do “cooperation”. By the result, self-interest and transactional relation would always exist in any collaboration formats. The present of self-interest and transactional relation were common thing. However when the self-interests of the economic motive took over the collective-interests (formal organization), it would cause an effect in its collaboration. The consequence of it was reflection of transactional relation where self-interest would become the priority purpose.

**Keywords: Collaborative Governance, REDD+, Rational Choice Theory**