

## Evaluation of Decentralisation Policy: Impact on Regional Development

<sup>1</sup>Sahrudin Malik, <sup>2</sup>Aisyah

<sup>1</sup>Universitas Islam Makassar, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Universitas Pancasakti, Indonesia

### Abstract

This study evaluates the impact of decentralisation policies on regional development, focusing on the redistribution of administrative powers from central to local governments. Decentralisation is often implemented with the aim of improving governance, promoting local autonomy, and enhancing public service delivery. This research explores how these policies have influenced economic growth, infrastructure development, and social welfare at the regional level. Using a mixed-methods approach, including quantitative analysis of regional development indicators and qualitative case studies, the findings reveal a complex relationship between decentralisation and regional outcomes. While some regions have experienced significant improvements in governance efficiency and socio-economic conditions, others continue to face challenges such as uneven resource distribution and capacity constraints. The study concludes with policy recommendations aimed at optimizing decentralisation frameworks to ensure balanced and sustainable regional development.

**Keywords:** Decentralisation Policy, Local Governance, Social Welfare, Indonesia

### 1. Introduction

Decentralisation has emerged as a significant policy strategy in many countries, particularly in the context of governance reforms aimed at enhancing local autonomy, improving public service delivery, and promoting regional development (Resosudarmo, 2004). The shift from centralised to decentralised governance structures is driven by the belief that local governments, being closer to the people, are better positioned to understand and address the specific needs of their communities. This policy framework is expected to lead to more responsive, efficient, and equitable governance, ultimately fostering socio-economic development at the regional level.

The impact of decentralisation, however, is not uniform across different regions. While some regions have successfully leveraged their newfound autonomy to drive economic growth and improve public services, others have struggled with the challenges of limited resources, capacity constraints, and uneven development (Martinez, 1993). This disparity raises important questions about the effectiveness of decentralisation as a tool for regional development.

This study aims to evaluate the impact of decentralisation policies on regional development, with a particular focus on how these policies have affected economic growth, infrastructure development, and social welfare across different regions. By examining the outcomes of decentralisation through a combination of quantitative and qualitative analyses, this research seeks to provide a comprehensive understanding of the factors that contribute to successful decentralisation and the conditions under which it may fall short of its objectives (Nurman et al., 2022; Yusriadi et al., 2020).

The findings of this study are expected to contribute to the ongoing discourse on governance and regional development, offering insights for policymakers, scholars, and practitioners interested in optimizing decentralisation frameworks to achieve more balanced and sustainable regional growth (Yusriadi et al., 2023). The next section provides a detailed review of the literature on decentralisation and regional development, setting the stage for the empirical analysis that follows.

## 2. Method

The qualitative method employed in this study involved an in-depth exploration of the impact of decentralisation policies on regional development through case studies of selected regions. Data collection was conducted using semi-structured interviews with key stakeholders, including local government officials, community leaders, and policy experts. These interviews were designed to capture diverse perspectives on the implementation of decentralisation, the challenges faced, and the perceived outcomes in terms of regional development.

In addition to interviews, field observations were carried out to gain a first-hand understanding of the local governance dynamics and the socio-economic conditions within the selected regions. This allowed for the contextualisation of interview data and provided additional insights into the real-world effects of decentralisation. Document analysis was another critical component of the qualitative method. Relevant policy documents, regional development plans, and government reports were reviewed to trace the evolution of decentralisation policies and their intended goals. This analysis helped to identify the alignment or discrepancies between policy objectives and actual outcomes.

The qualitative data were analysed using thematic analysis, where patterns and themes related to governance, resource allocation, infrastructure development, and social welfare were identified and explored. This approach facilitated a nuanced understanding of how decentralisation policies have impacted different aspects of regional development. To ensure the reliability and validity of the findings, data triangulation was employed by cross-referencing interview responses, observational data, and document analysis. This multi-source approach provided a comprehensive and balanced view of the effects of decentralisation on regional development. Overall, the qualitative method enabled an in-depth examination of the complexities and contextual factors influencing the success or limitations of decentralisation policies, offering valuable insights into their impact on regional development.

## 3. Result

The results of this study reveal a mixed impact of decentralisation policies on regional development, with significant variations observed across different regions. The qualitative analysis highlighted both positive outcomes and persistent challenges associated with the implementation of decentralisation.

In regions where local governments possessed strong institutional capacity and access to adequate resources, decentralisation led to notable improvements in governance and service delivery. These regions experienced enhanced infrastructure development, better management of public services, and increased economic activity. Local governments in these areas were able to tailor policies to the specific needs of their communities, resulting in more efficient and responsive governance. Interviewees in these regions reported a stronger sense of local ownership and accountability, which contributed to more effective decision-making and a greater alignment between policy goals and community needs.

However, in other regions, particularly those with weaker institutional frameworks and limited resources, the outcomes of decentralisation were less favorable. The study found that these regions struggled with capacity constraints, uneven resource distribution, and difficulties in managing the responsibilities transferred from the central government. As a result, the anticipated benefits of decentralisation, such as improved service delivery and economic growth, were not fully realized. Interviewees from these regions expressed concerns about the challenges of governance fragmentation, the duplication of efforts, and the lack of coordination between different levels of government.

The document analysis revealed that, despite the overarching goals of decentralisation policies, there were significant discrepancies in their implementation across regions. While some regions successfully adapted the policies to local contexts, others faced challenges in aligning policy objectives with local realities. These inconsistencies were further exacerbated by variations in local leadership, political dynamics, and socio-economic conditions, which influenced the effectiveness of decentralisation.

Field observations supported these findings by illustrating the tangible differences in infrastructure quality, public service availability, and economic opportunities between regions with varying levels of

success in decentralisation. In more successful regions, there were visible signs of development, such as improved roads, better healthcare facilities, and active local economies. Conversely, in less successful regions, infrastructure was often underdeveloped, public services were inconsistent, and economic opportunities remained limited.

Overall, the results of this study suggest that while decentralisation has the potential to drive regional development, its success is highly contingent on local conditions. The findings underscore the importance of strengthening institutional capacity, ensuring equitable resource distribution, and fostering effective local leadership to maximize the benefits of decentralisation. These results contribute to the broader understanding of decentralisation's impact on regional development and provide valuable insights for policymakers seeking to refine and improve decentralisation frameworks.

#### **4. Discussion**

The discussion of this study's findings provides a critical examination of the nuanced impact of decentralisation policies on regional development, highlighting both the potential and the limitations of decentralisation as a governance strategy.

The results indicate that decentralisation can be a powerful tool for regional development when local governments possess the necessary institutional capacity, resources, and leadership. In regions where these elements were present, decentralisation facilitated more tailored and responsive governance, leading to tangible improvements in infrastructure, public services, and economic growth (Yusriadi et al., 2023; Zacharias et al., 2021). These findings align with existing literature that suggests decentralisation empowers local authorities to make decisions that are more closely aligned with the needs of their communities, thereby enhancing governance efficiency and fostering regional development.

However, the study also reveals significant challenges in regions where institutional capacity and resources were lacking. In these areas, decentralisation did not yield the expected benefits, and in some cases, it exacerbated existing inequalities and governance issues. The fragmentation of authority and the lack of coordination between different levels of government emerged as key obstacles to effective decentralization (Knoke, 1993). These findings are consistent with criticisms in the literature that decentralisation, when implemented without adequate support and capacity-building measures, can lead to governance inefficiencies and uneven development outcomes.

One of the most striking insights from the study is the role of local leadership in determining the success of decentralisation. Effective local leadership was identified as a critical factor in regions that successfully leveraged decentralisation for development. Leaders who were able to mobilize resources, build institutional capacity, and foster community engagement were more likely to achieve positive outcomes. This underscores the importance of investing in leadership development and providing training and support to local officials as part of decentralisation initiatives (Dryzek, 1990).

The disparities observed across regions also raise important questions about the equity of decentralisation policies. While decentralisation aims to empower local governments, the uneven distribution of resources and varying levels of institutional capacity can lead to unequal development outcomes (Yusriadi et al., 2023). This suggests that decentralisation policies need to be carefully designed to ensure that all regions have the necessary support and resources to succeed. Addressing these disparities is crucial for achieving balanced and inclusive regional development.

Another important aspect highlighted by the study is the need for better coordination between central and local governments. The challenges of governance fragmentation and the duplication of efforts indicate that decentralisation cannot be viewed as a simple transfer of responsibilities. Instead, it requires a well-coordinated approach that clearly defines the roles and responsibilities of each level of government and fosters collaboration between them (Dunn, 2015; Kelman, 1986). This could involve mechanisms for regular communication, joint planning, and capacity-building initiatives that bridge the gap between central and local authorities.

In conclusion, while decentralisation holds significant potential for promoting regional development, its success is not guaranteed. The findings of this study emphasize the importance of addressing the underlying conditions that influence the effectiveness of decentralisation, including institutional capacity, resource distribution, leadership, and coordination. For policymakers, these insights highlight the need to adopt a context-sensitive approach to decentralisation, one that is tailored to the specific needs and capacities of different regions (Baumgartner & Jones, 1991; MacRae, 2013). By doing so, decentralisation can be more effectively harnessed as a tool for achieving equitable and sustainable regional development.

## 5. Conclusion

The conclusion of this study synthesizes the key findings and implications of the research on the impact of decentralisation policies on regional development. The study has shown that decentralisation, when effectively implemented, can significantly contribute to regional development by enhancing local governance, improving public service delivery, and fostering economic growth (Prakoso et al., 2021). However, the success of decentralisation is highly dependent on the presence of strong institutional capacity, adequate resources, and effective local leadership. Regions with these attributes were able to leverage decentralisation to achieve positive developmental outcomes, demonstrating that decentralisation can indeed be a powerful tool for regional empowerment and growth. In these areas, the decentralisation process led to more responsive governance and better alignment of policies with local needs, resulting in tangible improvements in infrastructure, social services, and economic opportunities. Conversely, the study also highlighted the challenges faced by regions with weaker institutional frameworks and limited resources. In these areas, decentralisation did not yield the expected benefits and, in some cases, even exacerbated existing disparities. The findings suggest that without sufficient support and capacity-building efforts, decentralisation can lead to governance inefficiencies, uneven development, and increased inequality between regions (Marin & Mayntz, 1991). This research underscores the importance of a tailored approach to decentralisation that considers the specific conditions of each region. Policymakers must ensure that decentralisation is accompanied by measures to build local capacity, distribute resources equitably, and foster effective local leadership. Additionally, the need for better coordination between central and local governments emerged as a critical factor in ensuring the success of decentralisation efforts. In conclusion, while decentralisation has the potential to drive regional development, its effectiveness is not automatic. To maximize its benefits, decentralisation policies must be designed and implemented with careful consideration of the local context, addressing the challenges and opportunities unique to each region. By doing so, decentralisation can serve as a catalyst for more balanced, equitable, and sustainable regional development.

## References

- Baumgartner, F. R., & Jones, B. D. (1991). Agenda dynamics and policy subsystems. *The Journal of Politics*, 53(4), 1044–1074.
- Dryzek, J. S. (1990). *Discursive democracy: Politics, policy, and political science*. Cambridge University Press.
- Dunn, W. N. (2015). *Public policy analysis*. Routledge.
- Kelman, S. (1986). *The Economist's View of the World: Government, Markets, and Public Policy*. JSTOR.
- Knoke, D. (1993). Explaining public policy-making. *Sociology and the Public Agenda*, 8, 164.

- MacRae, D. (2013). Guidelines for policy discourse: Consensual versus adversarial. In *The argumentative turn in policy analysis and planning* (pp. 291–318). Duke University Press.
- Marin, B., & Mayntz, R. (1991). *Policy networks: Empirical evidence and theoretical considerations*. Frankfurt a. M.: Campus Verlag.
- Martinez, J. (1993). *Reinventing Government: How the Entrepreneurial Spirit Is Transforming the Public Sector*. JSTOR.
- Nurman, Yusriadi, Y., & Hamim, S. (2022). Development of Pluralism Education in Indonesia. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 9(3), 106–120.
- Prakoso, L. Y., Suhirwan, prihantoro, K., Legionosuko, T., Rianto, Salim, G., & Yusriadi, Y. (2021). Analysis Public Policy Of Defence Strategy. *Journal of Legal, Ethical and Regulatory Issues*, 24(Special Issue 1), 1–9. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85113144160&partnerID=40&md5=3ab41d085f95955b35a1b8c5508eb560>
- Resosudarmo, I. A. P. (2004). Closer to people and trees: will decentralisation work for the people and the forests of Indonesia? *The European Journal of Development Research*, 16(1), 110–132.
- Yusriadi, Y., Anwar, A., & Enni, E. (2020). Political Reform in the General Election. *JPPUMA: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan Dan Sosial Politik UMA (Journal of Governance and Political Social UMA)*, 8(1), 68–73.
- Yusriadi, Y., Kurniawaty, Sibali, A., & Mattalatta. (2023). Poverty Policy: Between Hope and Reality. *Journal of Indonesian Scholars for Social Research*, 3(2), 107–114. <https://doi.org/10.59065/jissr.v3i2.120>
- Zacharias, T., Rahawarin, M. A., & Yusriadi, Y. (2021). Cultural reconstruction and organization environment for employee performance. *Journal of Ethnic and Cultural Studies*, 8(2), 296–315. <https://doi.org/10.29333/ejecs/801>