DOI <https://doi.org/10.18551/rjoas.2017-05.10>

**DECENTRALIZATION OF RURAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING AUTHORITY:
A CASE STUDY IN PULAU BUAYA AND LENDOLA VILLAGE IN ALOR**

Djaha Syukur Muhaymin Adang

Public Administration, Faculty of Administrative Science, University of Brawijaya,
Malang, Indonesia

E-mail: syukur.muhaymin@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

The 2006 Regulation of the Minister of the Domestic Affairs number 30 about Procedures for Assignment of District/ Municipal Government Affairs confirms that decentralization refers to handover of government affairs. However, the 2016 Regulation of the Minister of the Domestic Affairs number 44 refers to decentralization as a condition in which the central government gives some part of their power to regional government. Both terms have different meaning; handover means the central government, provincial government, city/municipal government are responsible for all government affairs including development, community development and empowerment of village communities and therefore, it is necessary to regulate the handover. On the other hand, the transfer of authority means that the government affairs including development, community development and empowerment of village communities take place in rural areas (village) but the central government, provincial government, city/municipal government are responsible for maintaining and regulating the authority and therefore, it is necessary to regulate the transfer.

KEY WORDS

Authority, decentralization, development, planning.

Development studies provide various different theories for practitioners to choose from. Gardner and Lewis (1996) divided development theory into three streams, the modernist, dependency and post-modernist. Long (1992) explained that modernization described development as a forward movement toward more complex and technologically integrated technological forms of modern society.

During the New Order, the basis for the national development was the Broad Guidelines of the National Policy (Garis-Garis Besar Haluan Negara). It was the declaration of the public will the The People's Consultative Assembly of the Republic of Indonesia (Majelis Permusyawaratan Rakyat) designed and authorized every five years. GBHN leaned towards the modernization theory that development planning was supposed to be centralized.

Having implemented the Five-Year Development Plan (Rencana Pembangunan Lima Tahun/ Repelita), it was revealed that there were wide gap in development taking place all over the country. Conyers (1994 p.162) recommended 'decentralized planning.' Regional planning will become more effective when the implementation of the planning is decentralized. Starting from 1999, the Political Reform took place in Indonesia, a new phase in the development planning model began; the current model was called bottom-up planning with the Development Planning Deliberation mechanism. The Development Planning Deliberation (Musrenbang) was the medium to channel public interest. The Regional Budget (APBD) would fund the public interest. However, it was revealed that most of the public interest had yet been accommodated. Most villages asked the municipality government to fund their program/ project/ activities representing the local's aspiration. Government of the village does not have sufficient authority and fund to accelerate the development in their area. Decentralization in Indonesia has encouraged new centralization in the municipality.

When decentralization becomes one of the important requirements for rural development acceleration, village (rural area) autonomy is essential. Several regulations related to the handover of the government affairs to the village government have been established, such as the 2006 Regulation of the Minister of the Domestic Affairs number 30 about Procedures for Assignment of District/ Municipal Government Affairs. The Minister of Rural Area, Development of Isolated Area and Transmigration has also established the 2015

Ministerial Regulation number 1 about the Guidelines of Authority based on Origin and Village-scale Local Authority as well as the 2016 Regulation of the Minister of the Domestic Affairs number 44 about village authority.

However, the Regent of Alor has yet analyzed and established any regulation related to the identification and inventory of authorities based on the rights of local origin and the local authority. As the effect, the one that holds the authority is the government of the municipality instead of the government of the rural area/ village. The government of the municipality has yet paid adequate attention to the rural areas. There is a gap between assistance the government provided for the rural areas located closer to the city center and one given to isolated areas (an isolated island).

Pulau Buaya and Lendola are two villages that have yet identified which activities they can maintain and which ones they can maintain but have yet been established. As a matter of fact, the identification will result in the draft of authorities based on the right of origin and village-scale local authority. The government of the rural area/ village may submit the draft to the government of the municipality so that the latter government can evaluate which type of authority they can transfer to the village government using the Regent and village regulations.

Another issue taking place annually is the village submitted the RKPDes and rural area budget to the Community Empowerment and Village Governance Board (BPMPD) to be enlisted. During the process of assistance, officials at BPMPD categorize which activities they can fund and which ones they cannot. However, the BPMPD admits they have no basis to do so. The only basis BPMD used during the process of assistance is "like and dislike" causing another problems for the government of the municipality and the village when financial audit takes place.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Authority. Authority is the official power that a person has because of his/ her position in an organization (Webber, 1947 in Gibson, Ivancevich, Donnelly, 1995 pp.481). Furthermore, Webber mentioned that authority, no matter what, was a part of power and power involves force and coercion. Laswell and Kaplan (1991) also argued that authority was formal power; they considered that the government had authority so that they had rights to order and established rules (Hendratno, 2009 pp. 81).

The governmental authority can only be obtained from both attribution and delegation. An organ may acquire new authority by attribution, while delegation of authority may occur if there is a certain transfer or transfer of authority from an authorized organ to another (Hendratno, 2009 pp.82). Based on the formal regulation, the authority of the village is the right and power of village administration in the context of village autonomy, which means the right to organize and manage the interests of the community according to local conditions and social culture. Therefore, the authority will strengthen the position and existence of subject who holds the authority to become a legal and autonomous one in decision-making (Eko and Rozaki, 2005 p.56).

Decentralization. Muslimin (1960) mentioned decentralization was delegation of authority on institutions and groups within the community in certain areas to deal with their own issues (Hendratno, 2009 pp.64). According to Pide (1999), decentralization was essentially transfer of power or authority in a particular field vertically from higher institutions or institutions or officials to institutions or institutions or functionaries below them so that those entrusted or overridden by certain authority are entitled to act on their behalf to take care of particular issues (Hendratno, 2009 p.65).

Conyers (1986) described the systematic distribution of functions in the context of decentralization. The distribution of functions was divided into several aspects; A) affairs, B) authority, C) levels, D) institution, and E) method. The expert further elaborated these aspects into sections, namely 1) nearly all types of affairs, 2) certain affairs and 3) only one affair for the first aspect, 1) policy-making authority, 2) financial authority, and 3) personnel authority for the second aspect, 1) provincial/ central, 2) municipality/ city, and 3) rural area/village for the third aspect, (1) specialized functional institution, and 2) multi-functional

institution for the fifth aspect and at last, 1) regulation-based, and 2) administrative delegation for the method (Muluk, 2005 pp.21).

Furthermore, Rondinelli and Nellis (1986) postulated that conditions affecting the implementation of decentralization programs, namely (1) a number of staffs and central bureaucracy supported decentralization and organizations responsible for the decentralization; (2) the extent to which dominant behavior, attitudes and culture supported or were conducive to decision-making decentralization; (3) the extent to which policies and programs were designed and implemented appropriately to improve the decision-making and management decentralization; (4) the extent to which financial, human and physical resources were available to organizations responsible for accountability (Huda, 2014 pp.49). The central government may use administrative decentralization to exercise control over its territorial units in order to increase greater political participation in decision-making (Rondinelli, 1990 in Muluk, 2005 pp.13).

Development Planning. Development was basically a manifestation of the service tasks implemented by the government in order to meet the needs of the general public (Riyadi & Supriady, 2003). Community-oriented development means that development outcomes to be achieved will be beneficial and useful to the local community and risks or costs generated by the development planning would be borne by the local community as well. In other words, an analysis towards both benefit and cost of development should be conducted prior to implementation of the development plan (Riyadi & Supriady, 2003).

Development planning provided a crucial issue in decentralization and local autonomy (regional and village) (Eko and Rozaki, 2005 pp.77-79). Planning, according to Abe (Eko and Rozaki, 2005 pp.78) was a response (reaction) to the future. As an effort to increase the accountability and transparency of village government administrations and improve service to the community, the village was also expected to better undertake its financial management and asset. The objective of government administration and financial management was to use limited financial resources the village had effectively and efficiently (Maschab, 2013: pp.146).

METHODS OF RESEARCH

The study used qualitative approach and the method was case-study. The settings of the study were two villages called Lendola and Pulau Buaya. Lendola was located closer to the area where the municipality government was located while Pulau Buaya was located far away from the area. Pulau Buaya was located on a separate island.

The focus of the study was decentralization of rural development planning, which was divided into (a) program and activities stated in the RPJMDes and RKPDes of the villages using the right of origin-based authority, (b) program and activities stated in the RPJMDes and RKPDes of the villages based village-scale local authority, (c) program and activities stated in the RPJMDes and RKPDes of the villages based on the authority given by the central, provincial or municipal government, (d) program and activities stated in the RPJMDes and RKPDes of the villages based on the authority given by the central, provincial or municipal government. Another focus of the study was attention the provincial government gave towards government administration, development, community development and empowerment in Pulau Buaya and Lendola. Yin (1996)'s analysis was the data analysis used in the study. It referred to holistic analysis, namely overall case analysis or intertwined analysis, an analysis for specific, one-of-a-kind or extreme phenomenon.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Taking into account the categorization of village development plans into four types of village authority, one should emphasized, based on the literature review, what the real authority is, how to obtain and use the authority. The legitimacy of authority is connected with various applicable laws and regulations. Authority is understood as an authoritative power that has the force of force to do something (Weber, 1947 in Gibson, Ivancevich, Donnelly, 1995 pp.481). If authority is understood as a formal power then any authority possessed by an official or an institution must have a legal or regulatory basis. The lawful legislation is

intended whether according to the prevailing customs, or the laws and regulations which have been established by the competent authority.

The Minister of Domestic Affairs had issued the 2016 Regulation of the Minister of the Domestic Affairs number 44 and the 2014 Government Regulation number 43 as the implementation of the 2016 Decree number 6 about rural area. The 2016 Regulation of the Minister of the Domestic Affairs number 44 established four authorities of the village and their explanation.

Making comparison between the village authority stated in the 2016 Regulation of the Minister of the Domestic Affairs number 44 and programs/ activities stated in RPJMDes, RKPDDes Pulau Buaya and Lendola, the findings of the study stated that the villages conducted several programs/ activities that did not meet the 2016 Regulation of the Minister of the Domestic Affairs number 44. It meant the two villages did not have any authority to conduct the programs/ activities. To be able to conduct program/ activities, the villages should identify and list four types of authority and the governor should establish regulation discussing the village authority as stated in the 2016 Regulation of the Minister of the Domestic Affairs number 44.

Furthermore, Pulau Buaya and Lendola villages had yet been able to develop accurate draft of village authority. They had yet used the 2016 Regulation of the Minister of the Domestic Affairs number 44 as the reference to develop the draft. As the result, the village put one program/ activity into two or four different types of authority. The villages proposed some programs to the municipal government solely asking for funding or assistance. These phenomena showed how much the government of the villages should learn to be able to understand the concept of village authority. They still relied heavily upon the higher government level.

Decentralization of plan had been conducted. The village government had used their authority to develop RPJMDes and RKPDDes so that they represented what the villages needed. However, most of the programs/ activities the villages conducted were not stated in the rural area budget since it only enlisted the activities funded by the village budget. The majority of the programs/ activities stated in RPJMDes and RKPDDes were funded by the regional budget. Every program/ activities funded by the regional budget was enlisted in RKPD of the municipality. These caused an overlapping.

Decentralization of planning was established in the 2016 Decree number 6 and the 2016 Regulation of the Minister of the Domestic Affairs number 44. The problem was how much commitment the municipal government had in accelerating village authority identification and inventory based on the rights of origin, village-scale local authority and other types of authority the central, provincial and municipal government assigned to the village. Therefore, Rondinelli and Nellis (1986) as cited in Huda (2014 pp.49) explained that several issues affecting the implementation of decentralization programs were (1) the central government staffs and central bureaucracy (as well as provincial and municipal government officials and bureaucrats) supported decentralization and organizations in which the responsibility was given; (2) to what extent dominant behavior, attitude and culture supported or were conducive towards decision-making decentralization; (3) how much policies and programs were designed and developed accurately to improve the decision-making decentralization and management; (4) types of financial and human resource as well as infrastructure were available for the organization in which the responsibility was given.

The government of Pulau Buaya and Lendola villages assumed that they had and were implementing the village authority de-facto but that had yet been implemented de-yure because there had yet been any Regent/Mayor Regulation consisting of lists of village authority (the 2016 Regulation of the Minister of the Domestic Affairs number 44a Article 21 to 23). In other words, there had yet been a basis for all of the activities identified and analyzed based on the types of authority the village government had because based on the scope/definition, authority was power formally owned by a person/institution to achieve certain goal.

The assumption that started the comparative analysis between Pulau Buaya and Lendola villages was there was a discrepancy between the attention given to area located close to the center of the government and that given to one located far away from the center of the government. The attention referred to one given by the municipal government to the village government. Parameter of the attention the municipal government gave was how

responsiveness the municipal government was towards suggestion given by the village government. The responsiveness referred to how fast and how much time the municipal government needed to give response towards the suggestions and the number of proposed programs/ projects the municipal government responded.

The village government admitted that there was a gap the municipal government gave to Pulau Buaya and Lendola government within the last five years. Distance was not the cause; instead, the cause of the discrepancy was how much representative the villages in the Regional House of Representative. The more representative a village had in the institution, the more attention the village got; when a village had no representative in the Regional House of Representative, it barely got any attention. In other words, the cause of such discrepancy was political instead of the significance of the program being proposed.

CONCLUSION

Nearly all of the programs stated in the RPJMDes of Lendola village use dual authority, both authority based on the rights of origin, village-scale local authority, as well as authority the central, provincial and municipal government assigned to the village government as well as other authorities the central, provincial and municipal government assigned. There has yet been either regent or governor regulation that establishes a number of concurrent and general affairs the municipal and provincial government assigned or any other types of authority the village government was responsible for.

There is discrepancy between the attention/service given to the villages of which location is far away from city center and those of which location is closer to the city center. Political factor becomes the cause of the discrepancy. Pulau Buaya gets more attention compared to Lendola because several individuals from Pulau Buaya become the members of the Regional House of Representatives of Alor; none of the people from Lendola becomes one.

SUGGESTIONS

The researcher encourages the government of Alor to identify and list all programs they have immediately based on the rights of origin, village-scale local authority, authority the central, provincial and municipal government assigned to the village government and authority the central, provincial and municipal government assigned to the village government through the Regent of Alor. Clear and consistent assignment of authority is directly associated to all village government staffs so that it becomes reference in developing the planning document (RPJMDesa). The identification and inventory should involve the village government and universities so that all programs/ affairs may be categorized into different types of authority and analyzed objectively and rationally. Involving independent institutions prevent some disagreement between the municipal and village government.

REFERENCES

1. Conyers, Diana. 1994. *Perencanaan Sosial di Dunia Ketiga, Suatu Pengantar*, Gajah. Mada University Press. Yogyakarta.
2. Eko, S. et al, 2005. *Prakarsa desentralisasi dan otonomi desa*, IRE Press. Yogyakarta.
3. Gardner, K. 1996. *Anthropology, Development and the Post-Modern Challenge*. London.
4. Gibson; Ivancevich; Donnelly. 1995. *Organization*. 8 Ed.
5. Hendratno, Edie Toet. 2009. *Negara Kesatuan, Desentralisasi, dan Federalisasi*, Graha Ilmu. Yogyakarta.
6. Huda, Ni'matul. 2014. *Desentralisasi Asimetris dalam NKRI*, Nusa Media. Bandung.
7. Long, Norman. 1992. *Sosiologi Pembangunan Pedesaan*, Bumi Aksara. Jakarta.
8. Maschab, Mashuri. 2013. *Politik Pemerintahan Desa di Indonesia*, Pol Gov. Yogyakarta.
9. Muluk, M. R. Khairul. 2005. *Desentralisasi & Pemerintahan Daerah*, Bayu-media Publishing. Malang.
10. Riyadi. 2004. *Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah. Strategi Menggali Potensi dalam Mewujudkan Otonomi Daerah*, Gramedia Pustaka Utama. Jakarta.
11. Yin, Robert K. 1996. *Studi Kasus Desain dan Metode*, Raja Grafindo. Jakarta.