IJHESS
International Journal of Health, Economics, and Social Sciences
PUBLISHER: Universitas Muhammadiyah Palu
ISSN: 2685-6689
SINTA 2

Collaborative Governance in Preventing Nonprocedural Cross-Border Migration: The Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program in Penakalan Village, Indonesia

Utami Nur[1]*, Anggun Pria Wibowo[2], Laras Putri Olifiani[3]
[1]Department of Government Studies, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Tanjungpura, Pontianak, Indonesia
[2]Department of Social Development, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Tanjungpura, Pontianak, Indonesia
[3]Department of International Relations, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Tanjungpura, Pontianak, Indonesia
***Corresponding author:** Utami Nur. E-mail: utaminur@fisip.untan.ac.id

ABSTRACT

Nonprocedural cross-border migration remains a governance challenge in Indonesia's border areas, requiring collaboration between government institutions and local communities. This study examines collaborative governance in preventing nonprocedural cross-border migration through the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program in Penakalan Village, Sambas Regency, West Kalimantan. Using a qualitative case study approach, data were collected through semi-structured interviews with representatives of the Penakalan Village Government and the Class II TPI Sambas Immigration Office, complemented by documentary data. The interview data were analyzed through deductive coding using NVivo and guided by the Collaborative Governance Regime framework developed by Emerson, Nabatchi, and Balogh (2012), which comprises principled engagement, shared motivation, and capacity for joint action. The findings show that collaboration has been established through communication, information exchange, institutional coordination, shared understanding, and leadership. However, these processes remain more developed at the level of communication and coordination than in sustained joint action. Limited program activities, formal community participation, program dissemination, follow-up planning, and operational resources constrain the continuity of collaborative efforts. This study concludes that although the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program has established a foundation for collaborative governance, its implementation has not yet developed into sustained joint action. Strengthening joint planning, community involvement, follow-up mechanisms, and operational support is therefore essential to improving collaborative efforts to prevent nonprocedural cross-border migration.

Keywords: Border Governance; Collaborative Governance; Cross-border Migration; Nonprocedural Migration; Desa Binaan

ARTICLE IDENTIFIERS

ORIGINAL ARTICLE
Volume 8 - Issue 4 - 2026
Pages 1236-1250
DOI: 10.56338/ijhess.v8i4.12342

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received: 09 September 2026
Revised: 17 October 2026
Accepted: 04 November 2026

CC BY-SA 4.0

INTRODUCTION

The border region of West Kalimantan, particularly Sambas Regency, plays an important role in the mobility of Indonesian migrant workers due to its direct border with Malaysia. Sambas is also recognized as one of the main migrant worker areas in West Kalimantan, encouraging the local government to strengthen migrant worker protection before departure, during employment, and after their return to Indonesia (Pontianak Post, 2025). Sambas has two border areas with Sarawak, Malaysia, namely Aruk in Sajingan Besar District and Temajuk in Paloh District (Syamsiah, 2020). This geographical position makes Sambas strategically important for cross-border mobility, while also creating vulnerabilities to nonprocedural migration and related challenges in administrative compliance, migrant worker protection, and immigration oversight.

Non-procedural migration in border areas is not merely a matter of compliance with departure procedures; it also raises important concerns regarding migrant worker protection. In Penakalan Village, Sambas Regency, local livelihoods are largely associated with agriculture and plantation activities, including rice cultivation and the production of rubber, pepper, and citrus fruits (Pahlevi, 2020). These economic activities provide an important context for understanding local livelihood conditions and residents' aspirations for better income opportunities. Previous research on migration motivations among Sambas residents has identified inadequate income, wage disparities, and limited employment opportunities as factors encouraging migration to Malaysia. This is also reflected in interviews conducted for this study, in which informants described the prospect of earning higher wages in Malaysia as an important attraction, particularly given the perceived difficulty of obtaining sufficient income in their place of origin.

However, economic considerations alone do not explain the persistence of non-procedural migration. Interview findings further indicate that some individuals perceive formal migration procedures as complicated and are reluctant to seek information about the required processes. Such perceptions may encourage the use of non-procedural channels, despite the potential risks and limited access to legal protection associated with undocumented migration. The geographical proximity of Sambas to Sarawak, Malaysia, further contributes to cross-border labour mobility. The scale of this issue is reflected in migration data for the 2022–2025 period, during which only 144 migrant workers were officially recorded as having departed through legal procedures, while nearly 1,000 undocumented migrant workers were reportedly deported through the border area (sambasnews.com, 2025). These figures point to a gap between local economic aspirations, cross-border labour mobility, and formal migration mechanisms. Therefore, preventing non-procedural migration requires an approach that goes beyond immigration surveillance and law enforcement by addressing local socio-economic conditions, improving access to migration-related information, and involving local actors in migrant worker protection efforts (Godenau & López-Sala, 2016).

This complexity makes collaborative governance relevant to understanding nonprocedural migration in border areas. Migration governance involves multiple actors, including central and local governments, immigration institutions, migrant worker protection agencies, village governments, law enforcement agencies, and local communities. Addressing migration-related challenges therefore requires processes that facilitate information exchange, coordination, trust-building, and joint action (Arifin & Wiraputra, 2020). Emerson et al. (2012) conceptualize collaborative governance through the *Collaborative Governance Regime* (CGR) framework, consisting of three dimensions: *principled engagement, shared motivation,* and *capacity for joint action*. These dimensions provide a framework for examining how diverse actors develop relationships and collective capacity to address complex public issues. However, collaborative processes do not necessarily take place under equal conditions. Differences in authority, access to resources, regulatory understanding, and institutional capacity among participating actors may influence their involvement and ability to engage in collective action (Ansell & Gash, 2018). Therefore, applying the CGR framework to border village settings requires attention not only to interactions among actors but also to the power relations and capacity differences that shape collaborative processes.

One policy initiative aligned with this collaborative approach is the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program, initiated by the Directorate General of Immigration to strengthen preventive efforts through increased community awareness of immigration services and functions, the prevention of Trafficking in Persons (TIP) and Migrant Smuggling (MS), and the development of information networks between immigration officers and village communities (Direktorat Jenderal Imigrasi, 2025). Within the jurisdiction of the Class II TPI Sambas Immigration Office, the program has been implemented in several villages, including Penakalan Village.

CC BY-SA 4.0

Through this program, village governments and local communities are encouraged to take an active role in preventing nonprocedural migration by sharing relevant information, looking out for one another, and reporting indications of potential nonprocedural migration to immigration authorities. Thus, the program extends beyond information dissemination and positions local actors as part of a community-based prevention network. Its implementation provides an important context for examining how a centrally initiated immigration policy is translated into collaborative practices at the village level, particularly in terms of how local actors understand and carry out their respective roles and responsibilities.

Previous studies have highlighted the importance of multi-actor collaboration in border governance and the prevention of nonprocedural migration. Sabam et al. (2026) found that collaborative governance in the development of the Aruk Cross-Border State Border Post (PLBN Aruk) area had been established through interinstitutional coordination, but remained largely administrative and had not developed into substantive joint decision-making. Similarly, Alunaza et al. (2022) showed that addressing the smuggling of undocumented migrant workers at the Aruk border involved not only the Indonesian and Malaysian governments but also non-governmental actors, such as the Consortium for Migrant Worker Advocacy (Kopbumi) and the International Organization for Migration (IOM). At the broader regional level, Anggita et al., (2024) examined cooperative governance in addressing irregular migrant workers and its implications for border resilience in West Kalimantan.

More specific studies have examined the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program and collaborative approaches to migration prevention. Nuranisya et al., (2026) in their study of the program in Citeko Village, Purwakarta, analyzed collaborative processes involving immigration authorities, village government, and local communities using the collaborative governance framework developed by Ansell and Gash. Their findings highlighted limitations in private-sector participation and the dissemination of information to grassroots communities. Similarly, Sintawati et al., (2025) examined the role of Immigration Village Development Officers (PIMPASA) in preventing human trafficking and migrant smuggling through a collaborative governance approach, emphasizing the importance of multisectoral cooperation and immigration officers' communication capacity. Taken together, these studies provide insights into interinstitutional coordination, non-governmental actor involvement, and collaborative approaches to migration governance. However, further investigation is needed into how centrally initiated immigration policies are translated into collaborative practices at the village level in border areas, particularly where participating actors have different levels of authority, regulatory understanding, and institutional capacity.

Nevertheless, broader studies of international migration and Indonesian migrant workers have largely focused on national policies, migrant worker protection, legal frameworks, and bilateral relations (Sukamdi, 2007). Research on nonprocedural migration has also tended to emphasize immigration control, law enforcement, and migrant protection, with less attention to how preventive efforts are organized through local institutions and community participation in border areas (Gravelle et al., 2012). Meanwhile, collaborative governance research in Indonesia has developed across various policy fields, including public services, environmental governance, regional development, and resource management (Tando et al., 2020). Arifin et al., (2024) further highlight the broader challenges facing Indonesia's migration and border governance, particularly in addressing irregular migration and strengthening border management. Despite these contributions, the intersection between collaborative governance and the prevention of nonprocedural migration at the village level remains insufficiently understood. In particular, limited attention has been given to how centrally initiated immigration policies are implemented through local collaborative arrangements, how village governments and communities understand their preventive responsibilities, and how differences in authority, regulatory knowledge, and institutional capacity shape their participation. This issue is particularly relevant in border villages, where local communities are directly exposed to cross-border mobility and where the implementation of preventive policies depends on the involvement of actors with different institutional roles and capacities.

This gap suggests that what remains insufficiently understood is not merely which actors are involved in preventing nonprocedural migration, but how collaborative governance develops and builds the capacity for joint action under conditions of unequal institutional capacity. In particular, it is important to examine how

CC BY-SA 4.0

actors establish principled engagement through problem identification, definition, deliberation, and determination; develop shared motivation through trust, shared understanding, internal legitimacy, and commitment; and build capacity for joint action through institutional arrangements, leadership, knowledge, and resources. These processes warrant particular attention in the context of the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program, where a centrally initiated policy must be translated into local preventive practices involving actors with different levels of authority, resources, regulatory understanding, and institutional capacity.

Drawing on the Collaborative Governance Regime (CGR) framework developed by Emerson et al. (2012), this study examines collaborative governance in preventing nonprocedural cross-border migration through the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program in Penakalan Village, Sambas Regency. It investigates how collaboration is established among immigration authorities, the village government, and local communities; how their relationships and shared motivations develop; and how institutional arrangements, leadership, knowledge, and resources support or constrain joint action. Theoretically, this study contributes to the application of the CGR framework by demonstrating how its three dimensions operate in a resource-constrained border village where policy implementation depends on local actors with unequal capacities. It also offers insights into the conditions that shape the translation of top-down immigration policies into collaborative preventive practices at the village level.

METHODS

Research Design and Sample

Data were collected through semi-structured interviews and document analysis. Informants were selected purposively based on their institutional roles, responsibilities, and knowledge of the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program. The study involved more than five informants, comprising the Head of Penakalan Village, the Village Secretary, several village staff members, and the Head of Section at the Class II TPI Sambas Immigration Office. These informants were selected because of their involvement in or knowledge of program implementation, inter-actor coordination, community engagement, information dissemination, and resource management. The interviews explored their perspectives on program implementation, coordination mechanisms, the roles and responsibilities of participating actors, community involvement, and the resources available to support preventive activities.

Documentary data consisted of presentation materials provided by the Class II TPI Sambas Immigration Office. These materials were used to complement and contextualize the interview findings. Interviews were conducted with informed consent, and participants' information was used solely for research purposes and treated confidentially.

Measures and Data Analysis

Data analysis was guided by the Collaborative Governance Regime (CGR) framework developed by Emerson et al. (2012), which comprises three dimensions: principled engagement, shared motivation, and capacity for joint action. Each dimension was examined through its respective subdimensions: discovery, definition, deliberation, and determination; mutual trust, mutual understanding, internal legitimacy, and commitment; and procedural and institutional arrangements, leadership, knowledge, and resources.

The interview transcripts were organized and analyzed using NVivo through deductive coding based on the CGR framework. The coding process involved categorizing interview data according to the three dimensions and their respective subdimensions: principled engagement, shared motivation, and capacity for joint action. This approach enabled the interview data to be systematically organized and examined in relation to the theoretical framework. To strengthen the credibility of the findings, interview accounts from village government representatives and immigration officials were compared. Presentation materials provided by the Class II TPI Sambas Immigration Office were also used as supplementary documentary data to provide additional context for the interview findings.

CC BY-SA 4.0

RESULTS

The findings indicate that the implementation of the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program in Penakalan Village involves collaboration between the village government and the Class II TPI Sambas Immigration Office in disseminating immigration information, preventing Trafficking in Persons (TIP) and Migrant Smuggling (MS), and facilitating access to immigration-related services. This collaboration is reflected in various forms of coordination, communication, information sharing, and community engagement. The village government serves as a local intermediary, connecting the community with the Immigration Office, particularly by providing information and facilitating immigration-related administrative needs. Meanwhile, the Immigration Office provides institutional support, technical information, and immigration services to strengthen community awareness of the risks associated with nonprocedural migration. The findings also indicate that collaboration extends beyond these two primary actors, involving other relevant actors in coordination and community-level engagement according to the needs and context of the program.

Based on the empirical analysis, the collaborative processes in the implementation of the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program are examined through the three dimensions of collaborative governance: *principled engagement, shared motivation,* and *capacity for joint action*. The findings show that *principled engagement* is primarily reflected in communication and information exchange among the participating actors. *Shared motivation* is reflected in shared understanding, commitment, and the legitimacy of the collaborative process, although evidence of reciprocal trust remains limited. Meanwhile, *capacity for joint action* is supported by institutional arrangements, knowledge, leadership, and available resources. Beyond these three dimensions, the findings also reveal several implementation challenges, particularly limited program activities, limited formal community participation, and unclear follow-up planning. These findings are summarized in Figure 1, which illustrates the collaborative governance dynamics and the need to strengthen collective action in the implementation of the program in Penakalan Village.



Figure 1. Findings of Collaborative Governance Analysis

CC BY-SA 4.0

Figure 1 provides an overview of the collaborative governance dynamics identified in the implementation of the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program in Penakalan Village. The findings demonstrate that collaboration extends beyond the formal relationship between the village government and the Immigration Office and is reflected in processes of interaction, communication, information sharing, shared understanding, and the use of available institutional capacities. These processes illustrate how the participating actors engage with one another in addressing issues related to nonprocedural migration, particularly through the dissemination of immigration information, efforts to prevent Trafficking in Persons (TIP) and Migrant Smuggling (MS), and the facilitation of access to immigration-related services at the village level.

To provide a more detailed account of these findings, the following sections present the empirical evidence according to the three dimensions of collaborative governance. Each dimension is examined through its respective subdimensions to show how collaborative processes are manifested in the practices and experiences of the actors involved. The analysis draws on interview evidence from representatives of the Penakalan Village Government and the Class II TPI Sambas Immigration Office, as well as supplementary documentary data and additional findings from program implementation. The findings across the three CGR dimensions and the additional empirical findings are summarized in Table 1.

Table 1. Summary of Collaborative Governance Findings in the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program

No.	Subdimension/Finding	Main Finding
1 Principled Engagement		
1.1	Discovery	Interaction occurs through socialization, direct communication, contact persons, and WhatsApp Groups.
1.2	Definition	The program addresses community understanding of immigration services, nonprocedural migration, TIP, and MS.
1.3	Deliberation	Actors discuss activities, participation, and potential collaboration with other institutions.
1.4	Determination	Program implementation follows immigration institutional mechanisms, while village-level follow-up remains under consideration.
2 Shared Motivation		
2.1	Mutual Trust	Intensive communication exists, but evidence of reciprocal trust remains limited.
2.2	Mutual Understanding	Actors share knowledge and recognize the need for coordination.
2.3	Internal Legitimacy	The program is accepted as a joint effort to protect communities and prevent TIP/MS.
2.4	Commitment	Commitment is reflected in communication, reporting, village activities, and potential BP2MI collaboration.
3 Capacity for Joint Action		
3.1	Procedural and Institutional Arrangements	Institutional mechanisms include Desa Binaan designation, PIMPASA appointment, reporting, meetings, and communication channels.
3.2	Leadership	Institutional and local officer initiatives support program implementation and expansion.
3.3	Knowledge	Knowledge covers immigration services, passports, TIP/MS, and procedural migration, but community understanding remains a challenge.
3.4	Resources	Implementation is supported by funding and village support but constrained by personnel, facilities, and vehicles.
4 Emergent Findings		

CC BY-SA 4.0

4.1	Limited Program Activities	Program implementation in Penakalan Village has so far been limited to one formal socialization activity, with no direct utilization of PIMPASA services reported by informants.
4.2	Limited Formal Community Participation	According to informants, approximately 20 community members participated in the formal socialization activity.
4.3	Limited Program Dissemination	Formal program dissemination remains limited, with information primarily introduced through the initial socialization activity.
4.4	Limited Program Planning	Follow-up planning at the village level remains unclear, while immigration authorities have considered expanding the program to other locations.
4.5	Informal Dissemination	Immigration-related information is also shared informally through communal work, local gatherings, and other social activities.
4.6	Expected Program Outcomes	The program is expected to improve community access to immigration information and services, increase awareness of procedural migration, and reduce associated risks. Gue nyebut

Source: Author's analysis based on interview and documentary data.

Note: Findings were derived from semi-structured interviews and supplementary documentary data. The interview data were analyzed deductively using the Collaborative Governance Regime framework developed by Emerson, Nabatchi, and Balogh (2012). Additional empirical findings concerning program implementation were also identified and presented separately.

Table 1 summarizes the findings according to the three dimensions of the Collaborative Governance Regime (CGR): principled engagement, shared motivation, and capacity for joint action. It also presents additional empirical findings concerning the implementation of the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program. The findings are drawn primarily from interviews with representatives of the Penakalan Village Government and the Class II TPI Sambas Immigration Office, supplemented by documentary data.

Principled Engagement

The findings indicate that principled engagement in the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program has developed through communication, problem identification, deliberation, and institutional decision-making. At the discovery stage, interaction between immigration authorities and the village government was established through socialization activities, direct communication, and a WhatsApp group. These channels facilitated information exchange beyond formal activities. At the definition stage, both actors recognized nonprocedural migration, Trafficking in Persons (TIP), and Migrant Smuggling (MS) as issues addressed by the program. However, immigration authorities demonstrated a more specific understanding of early detection and the modus operandi of TIP and MS. This suggests that the actors shared an understanding of the general problems, although their levels of technical knowledge were not necessarily equal.

At the deliberation stage, discussions focused on activity formats, locations, participants, community input, and the potential involvement of other actors, including the subdistrict government, police, and BP2MI. Immigration authorities also reported gathering suggestions from community members during socialization activities. At the determination stage, program implementation followed formal immigration procedures, beginning with proposal submission and designation by the Regional Office, followed by the appointment of PIMPASA officers. Immigration authorities had also considered cooperation with BP2MI and the expansion of Desa Binaan locations. At the village level, however, further activities and follow-up plans remained under discussion. This indicates that principled engagement was more evident in communication and institutional coordination than in the joint determination of subsequent activities.

Shared Motivation

Shared motivation was reflected in mutual understanding, internal legitimacy, and commitment, although evidence of reciprocal trust remained limited. Mutual trust was primarily reflected in the intensive communication between immigration authorities and the village government. However, the interview accounts suggested that expressions of trust were more evident from the immigration authorities' perspective than from

CC BY-SA 4.0

that of the village government. This indicates that regular communication did not necessarily translate into deeply established reciprocal trust.

Mutual understanding was reflected in the actors' recognition of the need for coordination in addressing nonprocedural migration. Immigration authorities contributed technical knowledge concerning immigration services and TIP/MS, while the village government contributed knowledge of local community conditions and migration-related experiences. Internal legitimacy was reflected in the village government's acceptance of Penakalan Village's designation as a Desa Binaan and the recognition of the program as a relevant initiative for the community. Immigration authorities also expected the program to provide practical benefits at the village level. Commitment was demonstrated through routine communication, reporting obligations, participation in village activities, and efforts to explore joint activities with BP2MI. Nevertheless, the limited number of program activities indicates that commitment expressed through communication and institutional responsibilities had not yet been fully translated into sustained collaborative action.

Capacity for Joint Action

The findings indicate that capacity for joint action is supported by institutional arrangements, leadership, knowledge, and available resources, although these capacities remain unevenly developed across the participating actors. Procedural and institutional arrangements include the designation of Desa Binaan, the appointment of PIMPASA officers, coordination meetings, reporting procedures, monitoring mechanisms, and communication through WhatsApp groups. While these arrangements are relatively established within the immigration institution, the village government's role remains primarily focused on facilitating socialization and providing access to immigration-related information.

Leadership was reflected in institutional initiatives and the efforts of local immigration officers to maintain program implementation and explore cooperation with BP2MI. Immigration authorities had also considered expanding the Desa Binaan program to other locations. Knowledge-sharing activities covered immigration services, passport applications, procedural migration, and the modus operandi of TIP and MS. However, immigration authorities identified community understanding of these issues as an ongoing challenge. Regarding resources, program implementation received institutional support and assistance from the village government, but remained constrained by limited personnel, facilities, and operational vehicles. These limitations potentially restricted the frequency of monitoring and other preventive activities at the village level. Taken together, the findings suggest that institutional arrangements and knowledge-sharing mechanisms were more developed than the operational resources and capacities required to sustain joint activities. This imbalance constrained the development of continuous collaborative action.

Additional Empirical Findings from Program Implementation

In addition to the three CGR dimensions, the analysis identified six additional empirical findings concerning the implementation of the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program in Penakalan Village. First, program activities remain limited, with implementation largely consisting of one formal socialization activity. Informants also reported no direct utilization of immigration services through PIMPASA. Second, formal community participation in the initial socialization activity involved approximately 20 participants, according to informants. However, participation should not be assessed solely through attendance, as community members also contributed suggestions and information during the activity. This finding therefore indicates the limited scale of formal participation in the initial activity rather than a general absence of community involvement.

Third, formal program dissemination remains limited, with the initial socialization activity serving as the primary formal channel for introducing the program to the community. Fourth, follow-up planning at the village level remains unclear, while immigration authorities have considered expanding the program through the establishment of additional Desa Binaan sites. Fifth, informal dissemination also takes place through community activities such as communal work, local gatherings, and other social events, providing additional opportunities to share information about immigration services and migration risks. Finally, participants identified several expected program outcomes, including improved access to immigration information and

CC BY-SA 4.0

administrative services, increased community understanding, and reduced risks associated with nonprocedural migration, TIP, and MS. These outcomes represent participants' expectations and should not be interpreted as measured program impacts.

Overall, the findings show that collaborative mechanisms have been established, particularly through communication, institutional arrangements, shared understanding, and information exchange. However, program implementation remains at an early stage, as reflected in the limited number of activities, the scale of formal community participation, the lack of clear follow-up planning, and operational resource constraints. These findings point to a gap between the establishment of collaborative mechanisms and their translation into sustained joint action.

DISCUSSION

Principled Engagement

The findings indicate that principled engagement has developed in the implementation of the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program through communication, information exchange, problem identification, deliberation, and institutional decision-making. Interaction between the Class II TPI Sambas Immigration Office and the Penakalan Village Government takes place through socialization activities, direct communication, contact persons, and a WhatsApp group. These mechanisms provide channels for exchanging information concerning immigration services, nonprocedural migration, and the prevention of Trafficking in Persons (TIP) and Migrant Smuggling (MS).

This finding can be understood through the Collaborative Governance Regime (CGR) framework developed by Emerson et al. (2012), which conceptualizes principled engagement as comprising four interrelated processes: discovery, definition, deliberation, and determination. In Penakalan Village, these processes are reflected in the establishment of relationships among participating actors, the identification of nonprocedural migration and related crimes as shared concerns, discussions concerning program activities and actor involvement, and the formal establishment of the program through institutional mechanisms. However, the presence of these processes does not necessarily indicate that all actors participate on equal terms. Their involvement must also be understood in relation to differences in institutional authority, technical knowledge, and decision-making responsibilities.

At the discovery stage, immigration authorities established relationships with the village government and community through socialization activities, PIMPASA, and communication networks. This finding is consistent with Nuranisya et al. (2026), who identified communication and interaction among immigration authorities, village governments, and communities as important components of the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program in Citeko Village. In Penakalan, these communication channels function as an initial mechanism through which participating actors exchange information and become aware of their respective roles and interests. At the definition stage, the program's concerns were primarily framed around nonprocedural migration, TIP, and MS. Immigration authorities emphasized early detection and community awareness of the risks and modus operandi associated with TIP and MS. This is consistent with Hilmanta et al. (2026), who identified PIMPASA as supporting immigration intelligence through community-level information gathering and the prevention of TIP and MS. Nevertheless, the findings suggest that the definition of program priorities in Penakalan remains more strongly shaped by the institutional perspective of immigration authorities. Although the village government contributes knowledge of local conditions and migration-related experiences, evidence of a mechanism through which village representatives and community members jointly establish program priorities remains limited. This suggests an asymmetry in problem-framing capacity, in which the immigration institution has a more prominent role in defining the issues and preventive measures addressed by the program.

At the deliberation stage, discussions have focused on activity formats, locations, participants, community input, and the potential involvement of other actors, including the subdistrict government, police, and BP2MI. Immigration authorities also reported receiving suggestions from community members during socialization

CC BY-SA 4.0

activities. However, these discussions have not yet developed into structured joint planning and decision-making. A similar condition was identified by Sabam et al. (2026) in the Aruk border area, where formal interagency coordination had been established but had not fully developed into substantive joint decision-making. Although the two studies examine different policy contexts, both indicate that the existence of coordination mechanisms does not automatically lead to deeper collaborative deliberation.

At the determination stage, formal institutional mechanisms have been established within the immigration institution, including proposal submission, designation of the Desa Binaan by the Regional Office, and appointment of PIMPASA officers. These arrangements provide an institutional basis for immigration authorities to engage with village governments in addressing migration-related risks. This finding is consistent with Sintawati et al. (2025), who highlight the role of PIMPASA in preventing human trafficking and migrant smuggling through a collaborative governance approach. Sudarmayana (2025) also discusses the role of immigration institutions in preventive efforts against human trafficking. In Penakalan, however, formal decisions concerning program designation and officer appointments remain largely embedded in immigration procedures, while no clearly formulated joint plan for subsequent village-level activities has yet been established. This indicates that principled engagement is more developed in communication and institutional coordination than in shared agenda-setting and decision-making. Strengthening this dimension therefore requires more structured opportunities for immigration authorities, the village government, and community representatives to jointly identify local needs, formulate follow-up activities, and determine priorities for preventing nonprocedural migration.

Shared Motivation

The findings indicate that shared motivation has begun to develop through mutual understanding, internal legitimacy, and commitment, although evidence of strong reciprocal trust remains limited. The village government recognizes its role as a link between immigration authorities and the local community, while immigration authorities acknowledge the importance of the village government in reaching residents. This relationship provides a basis for continued interaction. According to Emerson et al. (2012) shared motivation comprises four interrelated elements: mutual trust, mutual understanding, internal legitimacy, and commitment. In Penakalan Village, mutual understanding is reflected in the actors' recognition of the need to coordinate in addressing nonprocedural migration, TIP, and MS. Immigration authorities contribute technical knowledge concerning immigration services and migration-related risks, while the village government contributes knowledge of local community conditions and migration-related experiences. The complementary nature of these contributions provides a basis for developing a shared understanding of the issues addressed by the program.

However, evidence of mutual trust remains limited. Although intensive communication between immigration authorities and the village government was reported, expressions of trust were more evident from the immigration authorities' perspective. The available findings therefore do not sufficiently demonstrate that reciprocal trust has been established to the same extent by both actors. This distinction is important because frequent communication does not necessarily indicate that trust has developed equally among participating actors. Internal legitimacy is reflected in the village government's acceptance of Penakalan Village's designation as a Desa Binaan and its involvement in disseminating immigration-related information. Immigration authorities also regard the program as part of their preventive and early-detection efforts. However, the absence of reported opposition to the program represents the perception of an immigration informant and should not be interpreted as evidence of unanimous acceptance among community members.

Commitment is demonstrated through regular communication between PIMPASA officers and the village government, reporting obligations, participation in village activities, and efforts to explore cooperation with BP2MI. These findings are comparable to those of Nuranisya et al. (2026), who identified interaction, trust, commitment, and mutual understanding as important components of collaboration in the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program in Citeko Village. In Penakalan Village, mutual understanding and institutional commitment are

CC BY-SA 4.0

evident, but reciprocal trust and balanced involvement remain less developed. Shared motivation can therefore be understood as an emerging rather than fully consolidated dimension of collaboration. Although the participating actors have established a basis for maintaining their relationship, the limited number of program activities indicates that commitment expressed through communication and institutional arrangements has not yet been fully translated into sustained collaborative action.

Capacity for Joint Action

The findings indicate that the implementation of the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program is supported by several capacities for joint action, particularly procedural and institutional arrangements, leadership, and knowledge. However, limitations in resources and the continuity of activities constrain the development of sustained collaborative action. According to Emerson et al. (2012), capacity for joint action comprises four interrelated elements: procedural and institutional arrangements, leadership, knowledge, and resources. In Penakalan Village, formal arrangements include the proposal and designation of the Desa Binaan, the appointment of PIMPASA officers, reporting procedures, monitoring mechanisms, and communication channels between immigration authorities and the village government. These arrangements provide an institutional foundation for collaboration. Nevertheless, the institutional mechanisms are more firmly established within the immigration institution, while the village government's role remains largely focused on socialization, facilitation, and connecting community members with immigration authorities. This indicates that the formal basis for collaboration has been established, but the distribution of responsibilities for implementing subsequent activities at the village level remains limited.

Leadership is particularly evident in the initiatives undertaken by immigration authorities and local immigration officers to maintain program implementation and explore potential cooperation with other actors, including BP2MI. Plans to establish additional Desa Binaan sites also indicate an institutional direction for program development. However, these initiatives have not yet been accompanied by equally developed joint planning mechanisms at the village level. Consequently, leadership has primarily supported institutional program implementation rather than the development of sustained shared initiatives between immigration authorities and the village government.

The knowledge dimension is relatively prominent in the program. Information shared includes immigration services, passport applications, procedural migration, and the modus operandi of TIP and MS. This finding is consistent with Hilmanta et al (2026), who identified PIMPASA as a mechanism for community education and information gathering to support immigration intelligence. Alfarizi & Fatharani (2026) further describe the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program as a community-based immigration monitoring model involving an early warning system approach. This perspective highlights the potential for communities to move beyond being recipients of information and become part of prevention and monitoring mechanisms. In Penakalan Village, however, knowledge-sharing remains primarily manifested through socialization and information dissemination. The findings do not yet demonstrate that this knowledge has developed into an established community-based reporting mechanism or direct utilization of immigration services through PIMPASA. Thus, the availability of information and knowledge does not automatically translate into active community participation or joint action.

The resource dimension presents a further constraint. Although program implementation receives budgetary and village support, the study identified limitations in personnel, facilities, and operational vehicles. These constraints may restrict the frequency of immigration officers' visits and monitoring activities, as well as the ability to maintain regular engagement with the village government and local community. Hilmanta et al (2026) similarly identified budgetary and institutional capacity limitations in the implementation of PIMPASA functions. In the context of Penakalan Village, these resource limitations suggest that the sustainability of collaborative activities depends not only on formal institutional arrangements and the commitment of participating actors but also on the availability of adequate operational support.

CC BY-SA 4.0

Overall, capacity for joint action is present but unevenly developed. Institutional arrangements, leadership initiatives, and knowledge-sharing mechanisms provide a foundation for collaboration. However, the limited development of joint planning at the village level, together with constraints in personnel, facilities, and operational vehicles, limits the translation of these capacities into regular and sustained joint activities. This demonstrates that establishing institutional arrangements alone is insufficient to ensure continuous collaborative action without adequate operational resources and shared implementation responsibilities.

Additional Empirical Findings: Challenges in Program Implementation

Beyond the three CGR dimensions, the study identified six additional empirical findings concerning program implementation: limited activities, limited formal community participation, limited program dissemination, limited follow-up planning, informal dissemination, and expected outcomes. First, program implementation in Penakalan Village remains at an early stage, with activities largely limited to one formal socialization activity. Informants also reported no direct utilization of immigration services through PIMPASA. This finding can be compared with Nuranisya et al., (2026), who identified challenges in expanding information dissemination and actor involvement in the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program in Citeko Village. The similarity suggests that translating the program's institutional design into broader community engagement may remain a challenge across different local contexts.

Second, approximately 20 people participated in the initial formal socialization activity, according to informants. This figure describes the scale of participation in that particular activity and should not be interpreted as a measure of overall community participation. Community members also contributed suggestions and information during the activity, while other forms of participation may occur through information exchange and informal interaction. Thus, the finding points to the limited scale of formal participation in the initial activity rather than an absence of community involvement.

Third, formal program dissemination remains limited, with the initial socialization activity serving as the primary formal channel for introducing the program to the community. This indicates that the formal dissemination of program information has not yet developed into a continuous or regularly scheduled activity. Nevertheless, information is also shared through informal channels, which provide additional opportunities to reach community members beyond formal socialization.

Fourth, follow-up planning remains limited at the village level. While the village government has not yet developed a clear plan for subsequent activities, immigration authorities have considered expanding the program through additional Desa Binaan sites. This difference indicates that institutional program development is progressing more clearly than joint planning at the local level. This finding is relevant to Sabam et al. (2026), who showed that formal coordination in the Aruk border area did not necessarily develop into substantive joint decision-making.

Fifth, informal dissemination through communal work, local gatherings, and other social activities provides additional opportunities for communication between PIMPASA officers, village officials, and community members. Such approaches can complement formal socialization, but their contribution to sustained joint action depends on whether information exchange is connected to structured follow-up mechanisms. Finally, participants identified expected outcomes, including improved access to immigration information and administrative services, increased community understanding, and reduced risks associated with nonprocedural migration, TIP, and MS. These should be understood as expected outcomes rather than measured program impacts.

These findings should also be considered within the broader context of migration and border governance in West Kalimantan and Indonesia. Anggita et al. (2024) examined cooperative governance in addressing illegal migrant workers and its implications for border resilience in West Kalimantan. At the national level, Arifin et al. (2024) highlighted continuing challenges in Indonesia's migration and border governance, including irregular migration and the need to strengthen border management. These studies provide a broader context

CC BY-SA 4.0

for understanding why preventive efforts at the village level require sustained institutional coordination and community involvement.

Overall, the findings indicate that the central challenge is not the absence of collaborative mechanisms but the limited transformation of initial collaboration into sustained joint action. Communication, institutional arrangements, shared understanding, and information exchange have established a foundation for collaboration. However, stronger joint planning, broader community involvement, adequate resources, and clearer follow-up mechanisms are needed for collaboration to develop beyond coordination and socialization toward more sustained forms of joint action.

CONCLUSION AND IMPLICATIONS

This study examined collaborative governance in addressing nonprocedural cross-border migration through the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program in Penakalan Village, Sambas Regency, using the Collaborative Governance Regime (CGR) framework developed by Emerson, Nabatchi, and Balogh (2012). The findings show that collaboration has been established through three dimensions: principled engagement, shared motivation, and capacity for joint action. Principled engagement is reflected in communication, information exchange, problem identification, and coordination between immigration authorities and the village government. However, these processes remain more developed in communication and institutional coordination than in joint planning and decision-making. Shared motivation is reflected in mutual understanding, internal legitimacy, and commitment among participating actors, although evidence of strong reciprocal trust remains limited. Meanwhile, capacity for joint action is supported by institutional arrangements, leadership, and knowledge-sharing, but constrained by limited resources and the lack of sustained program activities.

Overall, collaborative governance in the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program in Penakalan Village has been established but has not yet developed into sustained joint action. This condition is reflected in the limited number of formal program activities, the scale of formal community participation, and the lack of clear follow-up planning at the village level. The findings suggest that establishing communication channels and institutional arrangements is not sufficient to ensure sustained collaboration. These mechanisms need to be accompanied by shared responsibilities, continuous community engagement, structured follow-up activities, and adequate operational support.

Theoretically, this study contributes to the application of the CGR framework by highlighting the importance of examining the relationship between collaborative processes and the capacity to sustain joint action in resource-constrained border settings. The findings suggest that the three CGR dimensions should not be understood merely as separate components of collaboration, but also in terms of how differences in institutional authority, technical knowledge, and resource availability shape their development. In this context, the operationalization of CGR requires particular attention to strengthening local actors' involvement in problem definition, shared decision-making, and the translation of institutional commitments into concrete activities. This provides a contextual insight into how a centrally initiated policy can be implemented through local collaborative arrangements involving actors with different levels of authority and capacity.

Practically, the findings point to several areas for strengthening the program. First, immigration authorities and the village government need to establish joint planning and regular follow-up mechanisms, including clearly defined responsibilities and activity schedules. Second, community involvement should be expanded beyond formal socialization through accessible information channels and community-based reporting mechanisms that allow residents to communicate indications of nonprocedural migration and related risks to immigration authorities. Third, local governments should consider providing budgetary and operational support, including the possible allocation of village funds for immigration information activities, while the Immigration Office should strengthen personnel support, facilities, and monitoring arrangements. Finally, coordination with other relevant institutions, including BP2MI and local government agencies, should be

CC BY-SA 4.0

developed through more structured collaborative activities. These measures could help transform the existing foundation of communication and coordination into more continuous and effective preventive action.

Limitations and Future Research

This study has several limitations. First, it focuses on a single village, namely Penakalan Village, and therefore reflects the specific context of the Desa Binaan Imigrasi Program in this location. The findings may not be directly generalizable to other program locations with different social, institutional, and geographical characteristics. Second, the study primarily draws on interviews with representatives of the village government and immigration authorities. The perspectives of community members were not directly explored through interviews, limiting the extent to which the findings capture their experiences, perceptions, and assessments of the program. Third, the study examines collaborative processes within a specific period and therefore does not capture how relationships among participating actors or their capacity for joint action may evolve over time.

Future research could address these limitations by conducting comparative studies across several Desa Binaan Imigrasi locations to identify similarities and differences in collaborative governance practices under varying local conditions. Further studies could also involve community members, local leaders, and other relevant stakeholders to provide a more comprehensive understanding of participation, community experiences, and perceptions of program effectiveness. Longitudinal research could additionally examine how collaborative relationships, institutional capacity, and joint action develop over time, particularly in relation to the sustainability of preventive activities at the village level.

DECLARATIONS

Ethics Approval: This study followed relevant research ethics principles. All participants were informed about the purpose of the study and provided their consent before participating in the interviews. The information obtained from participants was used solely for research purposes and treated confidentially.

Funding and Statement: This research was supported by the DIPA budget of Universitas Tanjungpura. The funding supported the implementation of the research and did not influence the study design, data collection, analysis, interpretation of findings, or decision to publish the results.

Author Contributions: All authors contributed to the development of the study. The authors contributed to the conceptualization, data collection, analysis, interpretation of findings, and preparation and revision of the manuscript. All authors approved the final version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgements: The authors would like to thank the Penakalan Village Government and the Class II TPI Sambas Immigration Office for their support and assistance during the data collection process.

AI Disclosure: Generative artificial intelligence tools were used solely to support language editing, grammar checking, and improvement of English readability during the preparation of this manuscript. The authors remain fully responsible for the research design, data, analysis, interpretation, and final content of the manuscript.

REFERENCES

Alfarizi, M. A., & Fatharani, A. Q. (2026). IMMIGRATION GUIDED VILLAGES AS A COMMUNITY-BASED IMMIGRATION. *Jurnal Ilmiah Kajian Keimigrasian*, *9*(1), 37–48.

Alunaza, H., Cantika, S., Anggara, D. M., Umniyah, A., Putri, K. A. S., & Manurung, G. N. (2022). ANALISIS DIPLOMASI INDONESIA-MALAYSIA DALAM MENANGANI PRAKTEK PENYELUNDUPAN PEKERJA ILEGAL DI PERBATASAN ARUK KALIMANTAN BARAT. *JoS (Journal of International Relations)*, *1*(1). https://garuda.kemdiktisaintek.go.id/documents/detail/2860127?utm_source

Anggita, I., Suswanta, Listiani, E. I., & Ahdarrijal, Y. (2024). Governance Kooperatif dalam Penanganan Buruh Migran Ilegal dan Implikasinya terhadap Ketahanan Wilayah Perbatasan di Kalimantan Barat Provinsi Kalimantan Barat di Indonesia Hubungan perbatasan antara Kalimantan fokus perhatian baik dari segi ekonomi maupu. *Jurnal Ketahanan Nasional*, *30*(2), 204–221.

CC BY-SA 4.0

Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2018). Collaborative Governance in Theory and Practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *18*(4), 543–571. https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032

Arifin, R., & Wiraputra, A. (2020). The migration policy during COVID-19 outbreak: The case of Indonesia's immigration governance. *Jurnal Studi Pemerintahan*, *11*(3), 327–354. https://doi.org/10.18196/jgp.113122

Arifin, R., Zulfa, E. A., Hanita, M., Josias, A., & Runturambi, S. (2024). Social Sciences & Humanities Open Unveiling Indonesia ' s migration and border governance : Challenges and imperatives post-pandemic. *Social Sciences & Humanities Open*, *10*(4), 101202. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ssaho.2024.101202

Direktorat Jenderal Imigrasi. (2025). *Desa Binaan Imigrasi Jadi Inspirasi di Forum Internasional DGICM 2025*. Direktorat Jenderal Imigrasi. https://www.imigrasi.go.id/siaran_pers/desa-binaan-imigrasi-jadi-inspirasi-di-forum-internasional-dgicm-2025

Emerson, K., Nabatchi, T., & Balogh, S. (2012). An Integrative Framework for Collaborative Governance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, *22*(1), 1–29. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mur011

Godenau, D., & López-Sala, A. (2016). Migration and borders: Empirical patterns and theoretical implications in the case of Spain. In *Global change and human mobility* (pp. 37–52). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-10-0050-8_3

Gravelle, M., Ellermann, A., & Dauvergne, C. (2012). Studying migration governance from the bottom-up. In B. Anderson, M. J. Gibney, & E. Paoletti (Eds.), *The social, political and historical contours of deportation* (Studying m, pp. 59–77). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-5864-7_5

Hilmanta, H., Hamdi, M. A., & Susaningsih, C. (2026). Peran Pimpasa Dalam Mendukung Pelaksanaan Intelijen Keimigrasian Pada Desa Binaan Imigrasi The Role of Pimpasa in Supporting the Implementation of Immigration Intelligence in Immigration-Assisted Villages. *Al-Zayn: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum Al-Zayn: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial & Hukum*, *4*(5), 2323–2334. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.61104/alz.v4i5.12791

Nuranisya, D. P., Aditya, I., & Muthmainnah, N. (2026). BUILT VILLAGE PROGRAM : An Analysis of Collaborative Governance in Citeko Village, Purwakarta. *Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan Suara Khatulistiwa (JIPSK)*, *11*(1), 189–199.

Pahlevi, A. (2020). *Pejuang Pangan di Desa Penakalan Itu Petani Perempuan*. Mongabay.Co.Id. https://mongabay.co.id/2020/10/24/pejuang-pangan-di-desa-penakalan-itu-petani-perempuan/

Pontianak Post. (2025). Bupati Sambas Temui Menteri P3MI, Perjuangkan Nasib Pekerja Migran. In *Pontianak Post*. https://pontianakpost.jawapos.com/amp/sambas/2507140018/bupati-sambas-temui-menteri-p3mi-perjuangkan-nasib-pekerja-migran

Sabam, H., Tahir, I., & Dione, F. (2026). COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE DALAM PENGEMBANGAN KAWASAN PERBATASAN DI POS LINTAS BATAS NEGARA ARUK. *Jurnal Kajian Pemerintah (JKP)*, *12*(1), 36–45.

sambasnews.com. (2025). *Seminar Perlindungan Pekerja Migran Sambas: Kolaborasi Nyata Mewujudkan Ruang Aman di Wilayah Perbatasan*. https://www.sambasnews.com/2025/12/seminar-perlindungan-pekerja-migran.html

Sintawati, F., Mulyawan, B., Widayat, W., & Piranti, N. M. (2025). PERAN PETUGAS IMIGRASI PEMBINA DESA (PIMPASA) DALAM UPAYA PENCEGAHAN TPPO DAN TPPM MELALUI PENDEKATAN COLLABORATIVE GOVERNANCE. *JaIM : Jurnal Abdimas Imigrasi*, *6*(2), 9–17.

Sudarmayana, I. M. L. (2025). UPAYA PENANGGULANGAN TERHADAP TINDAK PIDANA PERDAGANGAN ORANG DI KABUPATEN BULELENG (STUDI KASUS DI KANTOR IMIGRASI KELAS II TPI SINGARAJA). *Jurnal Komunikasi Hukum (JKH) Universitas Pendidikan Ganesa*, *11*(1), 1–13.

Sukamdi. (2007). Memahami migrasi pekerja Indonesia ke luar negeri. *Populasi*, *18*(2), 115–128. https://doi.org/10.22146/jp.12079

Syamsiah, N. (2020). Permasalahan Pekerja Migran Indonesia Pada Kawasan Perbatasan Indonesia-Malaysia Di Kabupaten Sambas Kalimantan Barat. *Cross-Border : Jurnal Kajian Perbatasan Antarnegara, Diplomasi, Dan Hubungan Internasional*, *3*(2), 84–95.

Tando, C. E. (2020). Collaborative governance in public service in Indonesia: A systematic mapping study. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial*, *18*(2), 144–163. https://doi.org/10.14710/jis.18.2.2019.144-163

CC BY-SA 4.0