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Abstract

Introduction

Decentralisation is a process of devolving roles and authorities from a central or national administration to local, subnational or regional unit for various purposes, from economics, political or pragmatic reasons. In Indonesia, decentralisation aimed to increase local responsiveness and efficiency in public services, particularly health. However, more than a decade after decentralisation implementation its impact on Indonesia’s health status remains unclear. Some health indicators, such as maternal and infant mortality rates, have shown significant improvement in recent years, but there are also signs of setback in other indicators such as contraception use and mother and child vaccination. These observations prompted questions of how decentralisation policy was interpreted and implemented at the local level, what factors influence policy implementation and what has been the role of central government in interpretation and implementation of the policy. This study explored local discretion in decision making processes, an aspect of decentralisation that has been largely been overlooked in the literature.

Methods

Using a purposive sampling process, qualitative information on local interpretation and implementation of decentralisation policy was obtained from thirty local stakeholders across eight districts. These stakeholders included representatives of the local executive, legislature and technical offices. Districts were carefully selected to represent variations that may influence policy implementation, such as Java and non-Java, affluent and less
affluent and urban and rural districts. Districts were also selected with consideration of
interviewer accessibility and familiarity.

In order to explore decentralisation in-depth interviews were performed using an open-
ended questionnaire to provide direction but at the same time give local stakeholders
flexibility to express their story. There were four foci of discussion: local health
planning, local health financing, local health program implementation and program
evaluation. Data was organised using the framework approach and later analysed using
an interpretive technique.

**Results and Discussion**

The central government intended decentralisation to increase local responsiveness and
efficiency by devolving the power to plan, finance and implement public services to
local governments. However, in reality the relationship was never straightforward. The
process of planning, financing and implementing public services, besides being
determined by local fiscal ability and technical capacity, was also influenced by a
number of other factors such as local commitment, local actors’ interpretation and
interest, central policy and negotiation between local and central governments. As a
result, instead of incorporating responsiveness or efficiency, recognised local health
programs reflect the negotiation between these potentially opposing factors. Thus,
compromise was often the result of decentralisation at the local level.

A particular example of this negotiation was development of the local health coverage
program, or *Jamkesda*. This program was the result of a combination of central
government inability to provide a program of universal coverage, public demand for
free health services, local politicians’ response to demand and support of local
resources. A free health service has always had strong appeal for both the public and
local politicians. However, as local fiscal ability varies, the extent of coverage offered by each district varied widely. This distinctiveness has been used by local politicians to strengthen and support local identity, especially with the fading and sometimes irrelevant influence of traditional allegiances in some districts. These allegiances, such as ethnicity and historical solidarity were once the major force in shaping local identity, but now such influences tend to be weakening. The void has been filled among other things by local government programs. Local politicians found Jamkesda to be a more effective local identification as it has a more direct and tangible benefit for the local public than other traditional bonds.

Implementation of decentralisation in Indonesia was often portrayed within the context of the dominant role of central government. Standardisation of health services, stratified government planning and national health programs, such as jamkesmas and jampersal, are prominent central government policies that have had considerable influence on local health policy. The national policy has at times collided with local interest that has required local government to find the most suitable solution that balances both central and local interests. One such example was the moratorium on government civil servant recruitment that was applied nationally. Even though the central government formally exempted health personnel from the policy, nevertheless in practice respondents from across the districts were prevented from recruiting health personnel as government civil servants during the moratorium. Some districts defied this policy by employing new health workers on time-limited contracts.

Indonesian health decision making is not all top down. Reciprocally, local government can influence central government policy. An example is the decision of a particular district to open a classless hospital, thereby meeting strong central disapproval. After
countless discussions a compromise was reached, not for a classless hospital, but for an all-third class hospital with a higher standard of care. These examples illustrate that the decentralisation process has been a dynamic and vibrant process.

This study shows that decentralisation has been moving towards greater central government involvement in local affairs, including in the health sector. In Javanese cultural values the central government has become the personification of father (*bapak*) that has the responsibility to nurture, direct, and at the same time limit, local power for the sake of national objectives such as stability and public welfare. Local discretions and initiatives are supported but only within the framework of central government policies and interests. Nonetheless, room for negotiation and ‘local defiance’ has at times been tolerated.

In conclusion, decentralisation in Indonesia has been a reflection of the national value of *kekeluargaan* that emphasise on uniformity rather than *keragaman*, or diversity. Therefore, decentralisation initiated as devolution of power with a clear distribution of power between central and local governments has become more akin to power-sharing where the power of central and local governments is increasingly fused and less specified.

*Key words: decentralisation, health program, local identity, local commitment, fiscal ability, central control, negotiation, local interpretation, shared responsibility.*
Thesis Declaration Statement

I certify that this work contains no material which has been accepted for the award of any other degree or diploma in my name, in any university or other tertiary institution and, to the best of my knowledge and belief, contains no material previously published or written by another person, except where due reference has been made in the text. In addition, I certify that no part of this work will, in the future, be used in a submission in my name, for any other degree or diploma in any university or other tertiary institution without the prior approval of the University of Adelaide and where applicable, any partner institution responsible for the joint-award of this degree.

I give consent to this copy of my thesis, when deposited in the University Library, being made available for loan and photocopying, subject to the provisions of the Copyright Act 1968.

I also give permission for the digital version of my thesis to be made available on the web, via the University’s digital research repository, the Library Search and also through web search engines, unless permission has been granted by the University to restrict access for a period of time.

Muhammad Syamsu Hidayat
Acknowledgements

Firstly, I would like to express my deepest gratitude to my supervisors, Dr. Afzal Mahmood and Assoc. Prof. John Moss, for their supervision, support and encouragement over the course of my PhD candidature. I would particularly like to thank Dr. Afzal Mahmood for his continual enthusiasm, vision, and determination for my research to succeed. I am also grateful to Assoc. Prof. John Moss for his help and motivation during the time of my candidature.

I would like to acknowledge the financial support from the Government of the Commonwealth of Australia through their Australia Development Scholarships (ADS) for sponsoring my study at the University of Adelaide. In addition, I would also like to acknowledge the academic and administrative staff from the School of Public Health for their throughout assistance and the International Office, particularly Niranjala Seimon and Augustine Bhaskarraj for their constant support since the first time I arrived in Adelaide.

I would like to thank the district government, the district health office and House of Representatives of Bulungan, Balikpapan, Kutai Kartanegara and Samarinda in East Kalimantan and Gunungkidul, Kulon Progo, Sleman and Yogyakarta in the Special
Region of Yogyakarta for the opportunity that has made this study possible. Special thank for Ibu Masitah, Ibu Ismi, Ibu Aniek and Ibu Hesti for helping me accessing these offices.

I am very grateful to my fellow Indonesian students for their friendship, encouragement, and help. Many thanks also to other PhD students in the School of Public Health: Siau, Gizachew, Habib and Ting who have helped me throughout my study, reading my chapters and at times giving constructive feedback for improving my thesis.

Last but not least and most importantly I thank my family, my wife and two children, my parents and parents-in-law, my sister and brothers and their families who always pray for me and help me in this journey.