

Middle Course Decentralization for Autonomous Regions with Island Characteristics in Integrated Nations

Petrus Polyando^a, ^a Faculty of Government Politics, Institut Pemerintahan Dalam Negeri, Email: ^a petruspholl@ipdn.ac.id

Decentralization and the autonomy policy, and their implementation, are two interesting issues that are always highlighted by various groups across the regions. Variations in results occur in many localities and not all regions are successful in bringing welfare into the community. Whereas, decentralization was chosen as an instrument to improve public well-being. This shows that there is a problem or there is a gap from the implementation of decentralization with results in certain regions, particularly in the tiny and isolated islands. This condition becomes ironic and needs to be highlighted, considering that the island region has also received a decentralization policy along with other regions. Due to these conditions and problems, this research was conducted to identify the factors causing decentralization in autonomous regions with island characteristics that have not been successful in improving the welfare of their people. This study uses qualitative method, where data is collected from informants from central government and respondents in autonomous regions characterized by islands. The findings reveal that the political interaction among stakeholders has not been specific and does not consider the real needs and difficulties of the people. This means the region's greatest interests have not been fully accommodated in decentralization policies. Furthermore, the lack of support in the regions, particularly from central government, means less available human resources, as well as the problem of overlap authority to manage economic resource potential and regional relations with supra-national institutions. This study provides an insight about what important aspects of a special decentralization policy for autonomous regions, characterized by islands, as a solution to the problem of decentralization that has not yet reached its objectives. This idea provides a middle ground in how to manage development with decentralization models in autonomous regions characterized by islands. Thus providing future directions for researchers and policy makers to explore this concept empirically.

Key words: *Regions with Island Characteristics, Decentralization, Integrated Nation.*

Preliminary

Democratic movements in various countries have an impact on the trend of paradigm shift in governance from centripetal to centrifugal (Prasojo, 2009), from one centralized system to spread (decentralization) (Shah, 1998 in Alisjahbana, 1999: 2). The results of the study show that about 95 percent of current democracies, both large and small, rich and poor, have chosen to surrender political, fiscal and administrative power to subnational levels of government. (Katorobo, 2004). The global trend towards decentralization has transferred authority, responsibility and resources to public functions from the central government to local governments (Mawhood, 1983; Smith, 1985; Bennett, 1997; Rondinelli, 1999: 2; Agrawal and Ribot, 1999; Oxhorn , et al., 2004; Ahmad & Brosio, 2006; Bardhan & Mookherjee, 2006; Keating & McEwen, 2006).

In connection with that, decentralization is then accepted as something that is absolutely unavoidable. The public claims that decentralization is a solution to the problem of realizing governance as being more effective, more solutive and democratic (Olowu, 2003). Decentralization is considered a key component in good governance and development (White, 2011: 1). Decentralization is considered as one of the solution instruments used to achieve the objectives of the nation and state in the framework of national unity with democratic government systems (Suwandi, 2002; Bayham, 2016). This not only applies in developed countries, but also becomes the focus of attention on the agenda of governance change in developing countries (JLGG Newsletter, 1999). These behaviors target all countries and even small countries have regional governments with a certain degree of autonomy (King, 1982; Duehacek, 1970, in Smith translated by MIPI, 2012).

The discourse attracts decentralization and regional autonomy, and develops variations in the results of its implementation in the countries that implement regional autonomy. Decentralization has produced a variety of conditions (Meheret, 2007). Some have achieved their goals (Barankay & Lockwood, 2007; Serrano & Rodri'guez, 2011), but some have not made significant changes to the local community or have not improved the social life of the community in some areas (Ghoshal, 2004). Countries that have succeeded in implementing regional autonomy without problems are often found in countries that have national characteristics that are homogeneous. In such countries, there is little reason for a group of people to demand autonomy at a broader level as a form of recognition of national government (Mcgarry, 2007). Meanwhile, countries that have not succeeded in achieving this, usually heterogeneous countries, often have a demand for autonomy. The argument is, that by regulating central and regional powers to give local regions more autonomy, the people in certain local areas will have ownership and provide better well-being for the local constituents. Whereas the main consideration is to improve service delivery and enable local governments to better adapt their services to local needs (Smoke, 2011).

The problem of regional autonomy is also enlivened by issues regarding ethnic, cultural and historical differences and even different languages, which result in a different social system between one region and another. To adequately address these regional differences a decentralized system of government is needed in countries with these characteristics (Smith, 1985). In this context, it also focuses on geographical differences which create a developmental gap between the mainland and the islands. Countries that have diverse groups, especially those that are territorially concentrated, need to find ways to work together in providing public services effectively (Bird, 2003). The facts of economic, demographic and social diversity, reflected in many government structures such as political jurisdiction and characteristics of government households in a country, cannot be treated as decentralized in one measure for all. With different instruments it is more likely to have different effects in certain circumstances, so different approaches are needed to achieve the acceptable results.

Accommodating the need for such a diverse approach, policies are needed to treat each region differently (Litvack, et al, 1999). Policies will be better suited to the needs of local residents, which assumes that there are significant differences in the needs of residents from one region to another, especially in developing countries. Specifically, differences regarding access to food, access to the proper education, access to the health, access to basic infrastructure, and other basic services that vary across regions (Prud "homme, 1995)

The treatment of this difference developed in the discourse about the new variant of decentralization and autonomy, namely asymmetry. Some countries, whether federal or unitary, large or small countries, seem to offer an asymmetrical paradigm in the practice of governance - between rich and poor cities, urban and non-urban, capital cities and border areas, and territorial or non-territorial groups based on race, religion, or language (Watts, 2000 ; Bird & Ebel, 2005). This paradigm of administering government illustrates the adaptive nature of political institutions in the framework of the transition of asymmetric autonomy that accommodates the interests of the central government, the values that can be accepted by all parties, and optionally chosen by certain communities at the local level (Bird & Ebel, 2005). This model gives an alternative to the problems that cannot be addressed by a symmetrical approach, especially in areas with unique characteristics that differ from other regions, such as areas characterized by islands.


In this connection, asymmetric decentralization is proposed as an alternative framework to address the problem of capacity disparity associated with decentralization (Litvack, et al, 1988; World Bank, 2001). Asymmetric autonomy is an effective tool to accommodate regional differences (Nagel & Requejo, 2011: 250). This concept refers to the possibility of decentralization which being implemented at different levels across subnational units, depending on the demand for reform and the capacity of local governments. In this context, special autonomy is an instrument that shows the reason for applying the distinctive characteristics of society in an area and the additional privileges that will be given to them. The details are in the form of recognition by the authorities (legislative and administrative) to

promote the cultural identity of a region - specifically language and religion, assignment of economic management authority, regulation of an independent fiscal system and the existence of special relations with the central government (Rolla, 2005).

However, this discussion of the treatment of asymmetric decentralization is more about the consideration of political aspects, economic development and cultural preservation as the basis or asymmetrical birth pressure (Watts, 2004). In fact, the effectiveness of asymmetric decentralization as an effort to alleviate poverty is also closely related to other unique aspects, namely geographical specific factors of the islands (Jalan & Ravallion, 2002). This idea then raises the concept of consideration in giving authority to the autonomous islands (Hepburn, 2010). However, the concepts offered are more specific regarding the general conditions that occur in a federal country and have not accommodated the needs of a unitary state which in fact there are autonomous regions with island characteristics. This is an interesting conceptual issue that needs to be dissected scientifically.

In other parts, the empirical issues that occur are related to the variation in the results of the implementation of decentralization which has caused polarization of the region due to the development imbalances that have occurred. This can be seen from the achievements of the Human Development Index (HDI),¹ where the fact that the development of HDI in autonomous regions outside Java, with island characteristics, still lag behind other regions and is even below the national HDI average. The following graph clearly demonstrates the development of HDI comparing the categories of autonomous regions in Java, autonomous regions outside Java characterized by islands, and autonomous regions outside Java characterized by non-island features.

1. HDI Autonomous Region on Java Island, Outside of Java Islands and Outside of Java Islands Non-Isles



Source: Processed from BPS National HDI Data, 1996 - 2013.

This phenomenon shows that there are interesting problems related to the current decentralization policy. The fact that the achievement of development in the archipelago seems unrelated to the main objectives of decentralization, even though decentralization has been implemented in all districts / cities in Indonesia.² This is an interesting issue that needs to be studied scientifically.

Based on the conceptual and empirical issues which stated above, this study was conducted in order to show that the causes of decentralization that have currently been implemented but have not yet increased the welfare of people in autonomous regions with island characteristics. This makes the researcher want to propose aspects that need attention as an alternative. This study is a new thing considering the discussion of asymmetric decentralization with the object of consideration of more island areas found in federal countries (Watts, 2004; Hepburn, 2010). The research context in Indonesia is expected to contribute to expanding the study of asymmetric decentralization in unitary countries, where the geographical specific factors of the islands are the main consideration in the policy.

It is important to ask in research questions that when implementing decentralization in island regions, and giving up different authorities to autonomous regions, this has not improved the welfare of the community? What are the aspects that need to be considered in a policy to appropriately hand over of authority for autonomous regions with island characteristics?

To answer these questions, the synthesis of the concept of delegation of authority that has been implemented and the factors that influence the implementation of decentralization are the main indicators in collecting relevant data. By exploring the theoretical perspectives on policy and the implementation of decentralization in general and asymmetric decentralization, in particular in the island regions, a hypothesis was developed about the factors that caused the failure of decentralization and the appropriate model of decentralization for autonomous regions with archipelagic issues. Data collected through interviews with central policy makers and organizers in the regions, as well as documentation studies, were used to identify the implementation of decentralization at this time. The results of the analysis were then reported to form new ideas regarding alternative decentralization specifically for the islands. This article concludes by exploring the theoretical and practical implications of the findings.

The Factors that have caused an increase in people's welfare for the implementation of decentralization in autonomous regions which are characterized by islands

Based on information from the interviews with many sources and the results of documentation studies, it was found that several important aspects that led to the implementation of decentralization in autonomous regions characterized by islands have not improved the welfare of the community. This is elaborated from the dimensions of political interaction in policies

and implementation support in the field. The following is a description of the important aspects in question.

Political Interaction in the Decentralization Policy

The dimension of political interaction in this decentralization policy concerns the support of superstructure and political infrastructure, then the process of policy formulation, and the involvement of local social groups in the policies of decentralization and regional autonomy. The decentralization policy that has been established essentially arises from a special and complex condition of the socio-political environment. Collaboration on the support of the three aspects above determines the birth of a decentralization policy that accommodates all interests. As reflected in the ideas of Rondinelli and Cheema (1983: 32), the national political structure, ideology, and process of policy formulation and involvement of interest groups also influence the level and direction of the implementation of regional autonomy.

In connection with the support of political superstructure and political infrastructure, it appears that the enthusiasm of the Government and Parliament in the decentralization policy is more to hand over the authority to the regions through the law that is produced. The dynamics of the changes in the Regional Government Law that were issued further emphasize the transfer of authority from the center to the regions and have not considered the specific needs of certain regions that have special uniqueness. Overall, the Government and the House of Representatives agreed to only determine the authority that was handed over and which was not submitted to the regions. The political nuances of the Government and the DPR are very dominant in their attention to the demands of the community to move from centralization to decentralization. This has not been specific to the surrender of authority based on the geographical considerations of the islands. Thus, it can be said that the existing support has not yet accommodated the specific needs of decentralization in the archipelagic region.

Furthermore, it deals with the process of policy formulation, which is through a technocrat mechanism and political mechanism. The initial stage was preceded by a technocrat mechanism which then followed by a political mechanism. Both of these mechanisms should produce policies that accommodate all interests and have a long-term positive impact. However, it often results in the inconsistency of the results formulated between the stated policy objectives. Draft results formulated by the technocrat process are often ignored in the process of political discussion so that it comes out of the spirit of the law produced. So that the real needs of the region have not been fully accommodated in the intended decentralization policy.

From the aspect of involvement of local community social groups in the decentralization and regional autonomy policies, this has not been received in the expected way. Social groups of local communities, especially islands, are not yet involved in the fight for their rights and needs and their aspirations in decentralization policies. In the process of understanding motivations

to obtaining information, it is often done by generalizing problems in all regions. This condition ignores the fact that the needs of the islands will have different needs to other regions.

The description of the paragraph above shows that the support of the superstructure and political infrastructure, as well as the process of formulating decentralization policies have not yet fully resulted in a decentralization policy that significantly changed the lives of the people of the islands. Each policy only touches on a number of general regional issues and not yet on specific issues regarding the island region. The archipelago still carries out the policies produced with the general model. This condition has led to decentralization that has been running for several periods but has not been able to improve the welfare of the people of the islands.

Submission Parameters of Government Affairs

The dimensions of the parameters of the authority transfer to the regions to carry out government affairs, needs to regard the criteria used in determining an area obtaining authority. These criteria have been established as part of the policies contained in the regional government law and have colored the implementation of decentralization. Each Law has a different treatment in the transfer of authority to autonomous regions, including autonomous regions, characterized by islands. However, the dynamics of the authority surrender construction with several variations of the criteria that exist in each regime of the Regional Government Law, have not seen any special treatment for autonomous regions characterized by islands. In Law Number 22 Year 1999, general construction is used, namely the government surrenders authority to autonomous regions to carry out all matters other than those owned by the center. This model of handover of authority applies generally to all regions, where there is no special treatment in certain regions based on certain categories. Then in the period of Law Number 32 of 2004, the division of functions was carried out based on more specific criteria, namely the criteria of externality, accountability, and efficiency by taking into account the harmony of relations between government structures. However, the existing criteria have not resulted in different authorities for the island region. This also applies in the period of Law Number 23 of 2014, where with the existing criteria, it appears that government affairs, submitted to the regions, apply generally to both the island and non-island regions.

It appears that all regions get authority that is not much different from one another. This seems less ideal given the diversity of regions that exist and even the characteristics of the islands and non-island regions. In de facto island areas have different capacities with non-island areas so they require a different approach. With the division of functions that tend to be the same based on existing criteria, the need for autonomous regions characterized by islands to carry out government functions is difficult to accommodate as a whole. The impact of the distribution of functions with these criteria is budget support and other resources for development in the region. As a result of the authority handed over, it applies equally between regions, so the composition of the transferred resource support is the same, including the island regions.

Thus it appears that the criteria used as a parameter of submission of authority, that does not pay attention to the geographical situation of an area of the archipelago, greatly complicates development in the area. This is what causes the disparity in the results of decentralization with other regions.

Regional Government Organization Model

The results of the study show that the model of government organizations that exist in autonomous regions are characterized by islands during the period of decentralization, referring to the provisions of the center nationally applicable to all regions in general. The regions have not yet formed an organization that fits the needs and characteristics of the region. Regions tend to form regional apparatus organizations that are not based on real needs according to the characteristics of the islands. Lack of knowledge and references to regional policy makers regarding ideal organizational models so that the formation of organizations tends to be the same as other regions and prioritizes the spirit of increasing echelon in the career interests of regional bureaucrats.

This behavior is coupled with national guidelines on regional apparatus organizations, which actually limit regions from forming organizations outside the prescribed composition. The regions are increasingly difficult to move and are increasingly forced to form regional organizations according to the menu provided by the center. As a result of all changes in existing regulations, aspects of the organizational needs of regional apparatus that are specific to autonomous regions characterized by islands have not yet materialized. Whereas, with the diversity of regions and objects being taken care of differently, they should be dealt with by varied organizational models. The consideration of the formation of regional apparatus organizations is separated between regions based on certain categories such as land and islands. This condition creates a gap between the existence of an organization formed by the implementation of government functions. The organization that was formed has not been able to accommodate some of the functions of government which should be the responsibility of the region. The impact of the administration of the functions of the government handed over to autonomous regions with characteristic islands has not changed the level of welfare of the people as in other regions.

The Capability of Regional Government Organizers

Capacity support for regional government organizers can be seen from the executive function organizers and the implementation of legislative functions in the regions. From the task approach and work results and behavioral approaches (Whiddent & Hollyforde; 1999: 3), it appears that the competence of local government organizers has not supported the

implementation of regional government functions in autonomous regions with island characteristics. In terms of the organizers of the regional legislation function (DPRD), the results of the study show that the productivity and quality of the local regulations produced are not in accordance with the targets set. The total number of local regulations produced as a whole and regional legislative initiatives are still lacking. Even though the amount of authority handed over to the regions organizes government affairs, it requires regional regulations to become guidelines for implementing the affairs of the governance of the social life of the local community.

Furthermore, with regard to the ability of the organizers of government functions (bureaucrats) as executors of government affairs, the quality and quantity of their apparatus shows that it is not ideal to support the implementation of regional government functions. In terms of numbers, there is a gap between the employees needed by each agency and the current employees. On the other hand, the quality of existing employees does not support the implementation of regional government. The facts illustrate that the level of formal education and technical and managerial competencies of island bureaucrats has not been able to reliably carry out many governmental affairs. The dominance of employees at the secondary education level shows that the implementation of government functions is characterized by the role of executive staff with capabilities still at the operational level. Generally employees with educational qualifications such as this work on the basis of orders from superiors, are not yet independent, and show a lack of innovation, so that the results of their work is less productive.

Based on an analysis of the capabilities of technical, managerial and regional political policy makers, which are confirmed by the organizers of the legislative function (DPRD) and the organizers of regional government functions (Regional Heads and Regional Devices), it is explicitly stated that the conditions do not support implementation decentralization. The implementation of the functions of government in the islands has not been fulfilled, or has not been able to be accommodated as a whole, by regional implementers who are the main drivers of development. Various basic needs of the community are not being served due to the limited quality and number of regional officials.

Economic Resource Management

The dimensions of managing economic resources are related to the efforts of autonomous regions in utilizing their regional potential for development and meeting the basic needs of the community. That with the decentralization of local governments is seen as having legitimate authority to use economic resources and with regulations capable of achieving broad economic goals (Blakely, 1989). By managing local economic resources a with regional efforts to improve their ability to increase the welfare of their citizens (Goldsmith, 1990; Wolman & Goldsmith, 1989). However, the management of the island's economic resource potential has not yet focused on the potential sector. Often regions are trapped in diverse management of resources but do not prioritize which ones are potentially prioritized and which ones are

supporting. Some commodity values from various sectors that are less productive from year to year are always forced into superior commodities. Meanwhile other potential resources in the archipelago have not been excavated and developed as primary commodity values.

Management and development orientation is still dominated by the primary sector as a mainstay of contributors to the local economy. Regions prioritize traditional sectors that are inherent in the community in regional economic development. Meanwhile other sectors (secondary and tertiary), which also have potential in island areas, have not been managed and are used as a mainstay of the local economy's carrying capacity. This behavior is influenced by the ups and downs of policy which causes an interesting pull of authority on certain matters between levels of government. In certain regimes it is determined to be the authority of the region, but at certain times it becomes the authority of supranational government. This condition causes the management of the economic potential of the islands to not support the improvement of the welfare of the local community. There has not been a breakthrough in innovation in the development of other potential sectors, impacting on the income earned by the region.

External relations between autonomous regions and supranational institutions

The dimensions of relations between autonomous regions and supranational institutions are concerned with a series of policies that focus on the support of the province and central government institutions in the context of development in the island region. This can be seen from the principle of deconcentration and co-administration as complementary to the surrender of existing authority. The implementation of these two principles has different roles for the island's autonomous regions. In terms of deconcentration, it is seen that relations are built indirectly with the islands because they only involve the central government and the governor as representatives of the central government. Organizing government affairs in island areas can be supported by programs from the ministry through deconcentration principles, when the provincial government brings proposals for the needs of the islands. The opposite happens where island areas do not get the right program when relevant programs are not needed. Even due to the demands of procedures and mechanisms of ministries that handle affairs so often ignore regional needs. The impact on the program implemented is not in accordance with what is needed in the island community. Thus, the pattern of relations between islands and the government from this deconcentration principle, has not yet contributed to regional development.

Regarding the implementation of the co-administration principle as another form of regional relations pattern with the central government and the provincial government, it was found that the central government and the provincial government had assigned a number of programs to the regions to carry out the administration of government and central authorities. However, the programs that departed from the proposals of the regions often did not synchronize with regional needs, both in terms of the budget and the proposed field of affairs. Some fields of

affairs that should be prioritized in the development of islands and are the responsibility of the central government and the provincial government, have not yet been implemented. Some of the basic needs of island communities are still neglected, even though in principle they are the authority of the central government and the provincial government. With the condition of the area that was left to drag on, thus inhibiting community activities in the archipelago. This is very ironic because the problems in the islands that should have been able to be resolved by the region itself, but it does not have the authority, so the problem is left.

Thus, it can be said that the external relations between the autonomous regions of the archipelago and supranational institutions (provincial and central) contributing to the causes of decentralization in the islands have not improved the welfare of their communities. Relations that are built through deconcentration and co-administration tasks have not become complementary which complements the existing implementation needs of decentralization. The development programs and activities carried out on the basis of these two patterns of relations have not been able to fill the gap in meeting the basic needs of the people of the islands.

Aspects proposed as a consideration of decentralization in autonomous regions of the Island Characteristic of the Islands

Based on the discussion of the findings stated earlier, this study proposes several aspects that need to be considered as solutions to the implementation of decentralization in autonomous regions with island characteristics. This is an effort to connect the main purpose of decentralization, namely to improve the welfare of the local community, by its implementation in the archipelago. The idea of this new concept as a middle ground in a special decentralized approach to autonomous regions is characterized by islands. The following concepts are proposed as important aspects in considering decentralization in autonomous regions characterized by islands.

Firstly, in the formulation of decentralization policies, we should pay attention to the de jure aspects and de facto aspects. The de jure aspect, in addition to consideration of article 18 of the 1945 Constitution as its main constitutional base, it is also necessary to refer to Article 25 A of the 1945 Constitution, namely the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia is an archipelago characterized by an archipelago with territorial boundaries and rights invite. Meanwhile, the de facto aspect needs to be focused on geographical aspects which do not only consider the area but pay more attention to regional characteristics from the island aspect. In connection with the formulation of policies, the aspirations of the interests of the islands need to be focused specifically so that they are not generalized to other regions in the formulation of decentralization policies. The idea encourages the involvement of autonomous regions with the characteristics of islands and local communities in the archipelago as an institution that is able to explain the social phenomena of the islands and can influence policy changes. For this reason, individuals who are able to connect ideas, interests and institutions are needed so that



a decentralization policy changes that accommodate the needs of autonomous regions are characterized by islands.

Secondly, with regard to the determination of criteria as a parameter in the transfer of authority, in addition to the criteria that have been established and have been implemented so far, it is necessary to add more attention to regional criteria based on regional capacity which is influenced by the geographical conditions of the area. This is important considering the transfer of authority by taking into account these criteria will result in the division of functions which more consider the fact of the diversity of objects managed in the islands.

Thirdly, the model of regional government organization as the organizer of government functions in the islands, needs to consider institutions that are in accordance with the needs and characteristics of the region. For this reason, the characteristics of local government organizations are needed to be able to realize the vision of the regional development mission, regional goals, and public services. The island area needs to be strengthened by the capacity of territorial lines that reach barriers on the islands, given that the objects taken care of are in the islands so that they need to get greater attention in terms of authority, funding, personnel and logistics.

Fourthly, archipelagic regions need to be given special authority to manage the potential of economic resources consistently in a special regulation, so as not to cause uncertainty due to changes in general regulations that continue to occur. As a follow up, island governments are given the freedom to plan and use budgets, then allocate to finance their own household affairs and the authority to collect financial resources and the authority to spend them at the local level. With this concept, the island region has a definite opportunity to prioritize its development field based on its existing potential and uniqueness. It is necessary to focus on area management in potential sectors that have not been developed in this case the secondary sector and tertiary sector.

Fifthly, Government support through deconcentration and co-administration tasks should focus on the typical conditions of the islands. Determination of the status of authority over an affair which later in its implementation was carried out assignments to the regions need to be reviewed. This is very ineffective considering the problems faced by local communities are continually allowed because the regions do not have the authority to overcome them. With conditions in the range of control so far in the archipelago, it should be fully delegated authority to all affairs to the autonomous region with the characteristics of the islands to carry out independently so that it does not have to go through a proposed mechanism to the top level government which tends to require large operational expenses and even lowered programs also not according to regional needs.

Conclusions and suggestions

Conclusions

This study identifies several factors that have caused decentralization not to gain prosperity for the people in autonomous regions with island characteristics. In general, in terms of political interaction in policy and implementation support in the field, it has not supported the real needs of autonomous regions characterized by islands in the administration of government functions. The existing decentralization policy has not accommodated the diversity of geographical characteristics of the regions so that they tend to be the same and generalized to all regions. Furthermore, in its implementation, the resources in the autonomous region with characteristic islands have not yet been supported as well as the activities of administering government functions on each island. This has an impact on the basic needs of the community that has not been met evenly from various sectors.

Suggestions

- 1) It is necessary to add special criteria in the transfer of authority as a complement to the general criteria that have been set.
- 2) It needs to be emphasized by the new perspective that the island area is a regency / city area that is characterized by islands, therefore the policy of the island area is focused specifically on the area in question rather than on the provinces that are characterized by islands.
- 3) The island area needs to be emphasized by the authority to manage its territory in particular, where the status of authority has so far been part of the upper level of government needs to be transferred to the responsibility of the island region.
- 4) It is necessary to strengthen regional institutional instruments to serve the people on the islands.
- 5) The policy of managing economic resources in the archipelago needs to be left entirely to the regions so that the focus of management is not only in the primary sector but also in the secondary sector and tertiary sector.
- 6) There are a number of additional areas for further research that need to be highlighted. This includes an investigation of whether special autonomy is possible as a model of governance for regency / city areas characterized by islands and whether the surrender of authority with different models of decentralization will improve the welfare of the people of the islands. As such, it will help confirm the ideal model in the transfer of authority to the islands. How the right proportion for the island region has the authority according to its capacity.
- 7) Considering that this research was conducted in Eastern Indonesia, it is suggested that future research be carried out in Western Indonesia as a confirmation material to formulate appropriate conceptual ideas regarding government management and decentralization models that are appropriate for the island region.

REFERENCES

- Agrawal, A. and Ribot, J. 1999. "Accountability in Decentralization: A Framework with South Asian and West African Cases", the Journal of Developing Areas 33, 4: 473-502.
- Ahmad, E. and Brosio, G. (eds), 2006. Handbook of Fiscal Federalism. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- Alisjahbana, Armida S., 1999, "Otonomi Daerah dan Perimbangan Keuangan antara Pemerintah Pusat dan Daerah", Makalah disampaikan pada Seminar Nasional Platform untuk Masa Depan Ekonomi Indonesia, Bandung
- Badan Pusat Statistik, 2006-2010. Indeks Pembangunan Manusia Indonesia. Badan Pusat Statistik. Jakarta.
- Bayham, A. (2016). A Measurement of Annual GDP Performance of the 162 WTO Members between 1989-2001 and 2002-2014. *Economy*, 3(2), 51-73.
- Bardhan, P. and Mookherjee, D. (eds), 2006. Decentralization and Local Governance in Developing Countries. London: MIT Press.
- Barankay, I. and B. Lockwood. 2007. Decentralization and the Productive Efficiency of Government: Evidence from Swiss Cantons. *Journal of Public Economics*. 91 (5-6). pp. 1197-1218.
- Bennett, R. J. 1997. 'Administrative system and economic space', *Regional Studies*, 31(3): 323-336
- Bird, Richard M., 2003. "*Asymmetric Fiscal Decentralization: Glue or Solvent?*", *International Center for Public Policy Working Paper Series*, at AYSPPS, GSU paper0309, International Center for Public Policy, Andrew Young School of Policy Studies, Georgia State University.
- Bird, Richard M. & Robert D. Ebel., 2005, *Fiscal Federalism and National Unity* Brilantes Jr., *Decentralization Imperatives, Lessons from Some Asian Countries*, *Journal of International Cooperation Studies*, Vo.12 No.1, August 2004, h.39.
- Blakely, E. J. 1989. *Planning Local Economic Development: Theory and Practice*. California: SAGE Publication, Inc
- Diaz-Serrano, L. and A. Rodríguez-Pose, 2011, *Decentralisation, happiness and the perception of institutions*", SERC Discussion Paper. London: Spatial Economics Research Centre.



- Ghoshal, Baladas.,2004.“*Democratic Transition and Political Development in Post-Soeharto Indonesia*”, dalam : *Contemporary Southeast Asia*. Vol. 26. No. 3, pp. 506-529.
- Goldsmith A, Binkerhoff DW. 1990. *Sustainability and Rural Agriculture Development in Institutional Sustainability Agricultural and Rural Development*. Global Perspective. Praeger New York.
- Hepburn, Eve., 2010, *A Comparative Analysis of Island Region Autonomy* Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association (CPSA), Concordia University, Montreal, 1-3 June 2010, University of Edinburgh.
- Hoessein Bhenyamin.,1995, *Sentralisasi dan Desentralisasi : Masalah dan Prospek, dalam Menelaah Format Politik Orde Baru*. Jakarta:PPW-LIPI –Yayasan Insan Politika – Gramedia.
- Hidayat, Syarif., 2004, *Kegamangan Otonomi Daerah.*?, Pustaka Quantum, Jakarta, 2004, hal. 29
- Jalan, Joytsna & Martin Ravallion., 2002. *Geographic poverty traps? A micro model of consumption growth in China*. *Journal of Applied Econometrics* 17 (4): 329–46.
- JLGG Newsletter., 1999, *Decentralization: New Legislation Boosts Japan’s Local Authorities*, Issue No.31, Summer
- Katorobo, James., 2004, *Decentralization And Local Autonomy For Participatory Democracy*, Makerere Institute of Social Research Kampala, 6th Global Forum on Reinventing Government Towards Participatory and Transparent Governance 24 – 27 May 2005, Seoul, Republic of Korea
- Keating, M. & McEwen, N. (eds)., 2006, *Devolution and Public Policy: A Comparative Perspective*. London: Routledge.
- Litvack, J., J. Ahmand, & R. Bird., 1988, *Rethinking Decentralization in Developing Countries*. World Bank: Washington, DC
- Litvack, J., Ahmad, J., Bird, R., 1999, *Rethinking Decentralization - A Discussion Paper* , The World Bank
- Mawhood, Philip ed. 1983 *Local Government in the Third World* (Chichester UK: John Wiley & Sons)
- McGarry, John., 2007, *Asymmetry in federations, Federacies, and Unitary State;*, *Journal of Ethnopolitics* vol 6, no 1, March 2007, pp 105-116.



Meheret, Ayenew., 2007. *A Rapid Assessment of Woreda Decentralization in Ethiopia*, Decentralization in Ethiopia. In: Taye Assefa and Tegegne Gebere Egziabher, ed. 2007.

Naskah UU Nomor 22 Tahun 1999 Tentang Pemerintahan Daerah

Naskah UU Nomor 32 Tahun 1999 Tentang Pemerintahan Daerah

Naskah UU Nomor 23 Tahun 2014 Tentang Pemerintahan Daerah

Olowu, Dele, 2003, *Local Institutional And Political Structures And Processes: Recent Experience In Africa*, Public Admin. Dev. 23, 41–52 (2003) Copyright # 2003 John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Oxhorn, P., Tulchin, J. S., & Selee, A., 2004, *Decentralization, Democratic Governance, and Civil Society in Comparative Perspective*. Washington: Woodrow Wilson Center Press.

Prasojo, Eko., 2009, *Reformasi Kedua : Melanjutkan Estafet Reformasi*, Jakarta. Penerbit Salemba Empat.

Prud'homme, Remy., 1995, *The Dangers Of Decentralization*, *The World Bank Research Observer*, vol. 10, no. 2 (August 1995), pp. 201-20. © 1995 The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/THE WORLD BANK

Requejo, Ferran, and Klaus-Ju"rgen Nagel, eds. 2011. *Federalism beyond Federations: Asymmetry and Processes of Resymmetrisation in Europe (Federalism Studies)*. Surrey/Burlington: Ashgate.

Rolla, G., 2005, *L'organizzazione Territoriale Della Repubblica*, Milano, 2005, p.75 ss

Rondinelli Dennis & G. Shabbir Cheema., 1983, "Implementing Decentralization Policies: An Introduction" dalam Cheema and Rondinelli (ed.), *Decentralization and Development, Policy Implementation in Developing Countries*, California: Sage Publication in cooperation with UNCRD, h.15-16.

Rondinelli, D. 1999. "What is Decentralization?" Decentralization Briefing Notes. J. Litvack and J. Seddon. Washington, IDRD/World Bank: 2-5.

Smith, Brian C., 2012, *Decentralization The Territorial Dimension Of The State*; Diterjemahkan dan diterbitkan oleh Masyarakat Ilmu Pemerintahan Indonesia (MIPI), Jakarta.

Smith, Brian C. 1985, *Decentralization: The Territorial Dimension of the State* (London: Asia Publishing House)



International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change. www.ijicc.net

Volume 9, Issue 9, 2019

Smoke, Paul, 2011, '*Decentralization in Africa: Goals, Dimensions, Myths and Challenges*', p. 9; Fox, 'Fiscal Decentralization in Post-Conflict Countries', p. 5.

Suwandi, Made., 2002, *Pokok-Pokok Konsepsi Dasar Otonomi Daerah Di Indonesia*, Jakarta, materi artiel tidak dipublikasikan.

Watts, Ronald L.,2004. "*Asymmetrical Decentralization: Functional or Dysfunctional*," Indian Journal of Federal Studies 1/2004 Copyright (c) Center for Federal Studies, Jamia Hamdard, New Delhi, India.

White, S.,2011. '*Government Decentralization in the 21st Century: A Literature Review*'. *A Report of the CSIS Program of Crisis, Conflict and Cooperation*. Washington: Centre for Strategic and International Studies

Whiddett, Steve & Sarah Hollyforde. 1999. *The Competencies Handbook*. England : Institute of Personal and Development.

Wolman, Harold, & Michael Goldsmith. 1990. *Local Autonomy as a Meaningful Analytic Concept*. *Urban Affairs Quarterly* 26, 1 (September): 3-27.

World Bank, 2001. "*Decentralization and Governance: Does Decentralization Improve Public Service Delivery?*", in PremNotes No.55, June 2001, <http://www1.worldbank.org/prem/PREMNotes/>;