PUBLICUS: Jurnal Administrasi Publik
URL: https://ojs3.unpatti.ac.id/index.php/publicus/

Governance Constraints and Institutional Dynamics in Road and Bridge Infrastructure Development: Evidence from Kokas District, Indonesia

Aulia Saraswaty[1*], Aqilah Attamimi[2]

[1]Road and Bridge Construction Engineering Technology, Fakfak State Polytechnic, Indonesia
[2]Road and Bridge Construction Engineering Technology, Fakfak State Polytechnic, Indonesia
*Correspondence E-Mail: auliasaraswaty@polinef.id

Abstract

Infrastructure development plays a critical role in promoting regional connectivity, improving public service delivery, and supporting socio-economic growth, particularly in remote and decentralized regions. However, infrastructure projects in peripheral areas frequently encounter governance-related challenges that constrain their effectiveness and sustainability. This study examines governance challenges in road and bridge infrastructure development in Kokas District, Fakfak Regency, Indonesia, using a public administration perspective. The research focuses on four key governance dimensions: institutional capacity, policy implementation processes, accountability mechanisms, and stakeholder participation. A qualitative case study design was employed to capture contextualized insights into administrative practices and governance dynamics. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with 15 purposively selected informants, including local government officials, district administrators, project implementers, and community representatives. Document analysis of planning reports, regulatory frameworks, and project records was conducted to triangulate interview findings. Data were analyzed using thematic analysis to identify patterns and relationships across governance dimensions. The findings indicate that governance challenges significantly influence infrastructure development outcomes. Limited institutional capacity, coordination constraints, procedural accountability practices, and predominantly symbolic participation mechanisms collectively shape project implementation processes. These governance conditions contribute to administrative inefficiencies, implementation delays, and reduced infrastructure sustainability. The study highlights that infrastructure development constraints in remote districts are deeply embedded in governance structures rather than technical factors alone. This research contributes to governance and decentralization scholarship by emphasizing the importance of strengthening institutional capacity, coordination mechanisms, transparency practices, and participatory governance to improve infrastructure development effectiveness in decentralized and peripheral contexts.

Keywords: Infrastructure Governance, Public Administration, Road and Bridge Development, Local Government.

INTRODUCTION

Infrastructure development is widely recognized as a fundamental pillar of public service delivery, regional connectivity, and socio-economic transformation. Roads and bridges, in particular, function as essential public assets that enable mobility, facilitate access to markets and social services, and reduce

spatial inequalities. Within public administration scholarship, infrastructure development is no longer viewed solely as a technical or engineering activity but as a complex governance process involving institutional arrangements, policy coordination, resource management, and accountability structures (Peters, 2018; Pierre & Peters, 2020). Consequently, governance quality plays a decisive role in determining whether infrastructure investments generate sustainable and equitable development outcomes.

Decentralization reforms have significantly reshaped the institutional landscape of infrastructure provision in many developing countries. These reforms are designed to enhance administrative responsiveness, efficiency, and democratic accountability by transferring authority and fiscal responsibilities to subnational governments (Smoke, 2018; World Bank, 2017). In theory, decentralization allows local governments to tailor infrastructure policies to local needs, improve participatory decision-making, and strengthen service delivery performance. However, empirical evidence suggests that decentralization does not automatically produce improved governance outcomes, particularly in regions characterized by limited institutional capacity and administrative resources (Andrews, Pritchett, & Woolcock, 2017; Grindle, 2017).

Indonesia presents a compelling case for examining these dynamics. Since the implementation of regional autonomy, district and municipal governments have assumed expanded responsibilities in infrastructure planning and development. While decentralization has created opportunities for localized governance innovation, it has also revealed substantial disparities in administrative capacity, coordination effectiveness, and governance performance across regions (Aspinall, 2020; World Bank, 2021). These disparities are especially visible in remote and peripheral districts, where infrastructure deficits persist despite sustained public investment. In such contexts, governance challenges frequently undermine policy implementation, project efficiency, and infrastructure sustainability.

From a governance perspective, infrastructure development depends on the interaction of institutions, actors, and regulatory frameworks that shape decision-making and implementation processes (OECD, 2020; Torfing et al., 2021). Good governance principles emphasize institutional capacity, coordination, transparency, accountability, and stakeholder participation as critical determinants of public sector effectiveness (Ansell & Torfing, 2021; OECD, 2021). Weaknesses in these dimensions may lead to delays, cost overruns, uneven infrastructure quality, and diminished public trust (Flyvbjerg, 2017). In decentralized systems, governance failures at the local level may be particularly consequential, as subnational governments are directly responsible for translating policy commitments into tangible development outcomes.

Institutional capacity constitutes one of the most significant challenges in decentralized governance. Effective infrastructure management requires technical expertise, administrative competence, organizational stability, and adequate human resources (Andrews et al., 2017; Peters, 2018). Without sufficient capacity, local governments may struggle to conduct evidence-based planning, supervise projects, and coordinate across agencies. Similarly, policy implementation is shaped by administrative coordination, budget reliability, and contextual adaptation (Hill & Hupe, 2019). Fragmented coordination structures and procedural rigidities often constrain implementation effectiveness, particularly in geographically isolated areas where logistical complexities are pronounced.

Accountability and transparency mechanisms further influence infrastructure governance. Public accountability frameworks emphasize reporting, oversight, and answerability as essential components of democratic governance (Bovens, Goodin, & Schillemans, 2017; Lodge & Hood, 2016). However, accountability systems in developing contexts often prioritize upward compliance to higher authorities rather than downward transparency to citizens (Grindle, 2017). Limited public access to information regarding budgets, timelines, and project outcomes can weaken community oversight and reduce trust in public institutions. In parallel, stakeholder participation has been widely advocated as a mechanism for enhancing policy legitimacy, responsiveness, and sustainability (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2019; Ansell & Torfing, 2021). Yet, participatory processes are frequently implemented as symbolic consultations rather than substantive engagement.

Despite a growing body of literature on infrastructure development and governance, much of the existing research has focused on national-level policy frameworks, financing models, or megaproject

performance (Flyvbjerg, 2017; OECD, 2020). Comparatively fewer studies have explored infrastructure governance at the district level, particularly in remote regions where administrative constraints and contextual challenges are acute. National or macro-level analyses may obscure localized governance dynamics, including institutional limitations, coordination practices, and community engagement processes (Aspinall, 2020; World Bank, 2023). This gap limits the ability of scholars and policymakers to understand how governance arrangements shape infrastructure outcomes in peripheral settings.

Kokas District in Fakfak Regency represents a relevant empirical context for examining these issues. As a remote district in eastern Indonesia, Kokas faces geographical constraints, limited infrastructure accessibility, and administrative resource challenges. Preliminary observations and policy reports suggest that road and bridge development initiatives encounter difficulties related to institutional capacity, inter-agency coordination, accountability practices, and stakeholder participation. These conditions raise important questions regarding how governance dynamics influence infrastructure development effectiveness in decentralized and peripheral environments.

This study addresses this gap by examining governance challenges in road and bridge infrastructure development in Kokas District. Drawing upon a public administration and governance framework, the research focuses on four interrelated dimensions: institutional capacity, policy implementation processes, accountability mechanisms, and stakeholder participation. By adopting a qualitative case study approach, this study aims to provide an in-depth, context-sensitive understanding of governance practices and constraints shaping infrastructure development at the district level.

By situating infrastructure development within a governance perspective, this research contributes to the broader discourse on decentralization, public sector performance, and infrastructure governance. The findings are expected to inform both theoretical debates and practical policy interventions, particularly in relation to strengthening governance arrangements in remote and capacity-constrained local governments.

METHODS

Research Design

This study employed a qualitative research approach using a case study design to explore governance challenges in road and bridge infrastructure development. A qualitative strategy was considered appropriate because the research sought to capture contextualized insights into administrative processes, institutional interactions, and governance practices rather than to test causal relationships quantitatively (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Flick, 2018). The case study design enabled an in-depth and holistic examination of governance dynamics within a real-life institutional setting, which is particularly suitable for investigating complex public administration phenomena (Yin, 2018; George & Bennett, 2016).

Case Selection and Research Site

The research was conducted in Kokas District, Fakfak Regency, Indonesia. The district was selected purposively based on its relevance as a remote and peripheral administrative area characterized by geographical constraints, limited infrastructure accessibility, and known implementation challenges in public service delivery. Purposive case selection is widely recommended in qualitative case study research when the objective is analytical depth rather than statistical generalization (Yin, 2018; Patton, 2019). Kokas District represents a critical case for examining how governance arrangements operate under conditions of limited administrative capacity and logistical complexity.

Participants and Sampling Strategy

The study relied on purposive sampling to identify key informants with direct knowledge and involvement in infrastructure governance processes. A total of 15 informants participated, comprising local government officials, district administrators, infrastructure project implementers, and community representatives. Purposive sampling is appropriate in qualitative research when participants are selected based on their expertise, institutional roles, and ability to provide rich information relevant to the research objectives (Creswell & Creswell, 2018; Patton, 2019).

Informant selection followed three criteria:
1. Institutional relevance (direct involvement in planning, implementation, or oversight)
2. Experiential knowledge (first-hand experience with infrastructure projects)
3. Role diversity (representation of multiple governance actors)

Data collection continued until information saturation was achieved, defined as the point at which additional interviews no longer yielded substantively new insights (Flick, 2018; Tracy, 2020).

Data Collection Techniques

Data were collected through:
1. Semi-structured in-depth interviews
   Semi-structured interviews allowed the researcher to explore informants' experiences, perceptions, and interpretations while maintaining flexibility to probe emerging themes (Tracy, 2020; Creswell & Creswell, 2018). Interviews were conducted between March and April 2025, with durations ranging from 45 to 90 minutes. All interviews were audio-recorded with participant consent and supplemented by field notes.
2. Document analysis
   Document analysis was undertaken to examine planning documents, regulatory frameworks, project reports, and accountability records related to road and bridge development. This technique enabled triangulation between formal policy narratives and empirical governance practices (Yin, 2018; Flick, 2018).

Research Instruments

The primary research instruments included:
1. A semi-structured interview guide organized around four governance dimensions:
   - Institutional capacity,
   - Policy implementation,
   - Accountability mechanisms, and
   - Stakeholder participation.
2. A document review checklist to ensure systematic examination of policy and administrative records.

The use of flexible yet structured instruments aligns with qualitative inquiry principles emphasizing depth, reflexivity, and responsiveness to field contexts (Tracy, 2020; Creswell & Creswell, 2018).

Data Analysis Procedures

Data analysis followed an interactive thematic analysis process. Interview transcripts and documentary materials were coded using a hybrid approach combining deductive categories derived from governance theory and inductive themes emerging from the data (Nowell et al., 2017; Flick, 2018).

The analysis proceeded through several stages:
1. Data familiarization (repeated reading of transcripts)
2. Initial coding (identification of governance-related segments)
3. Theme development (grouping codes into analytical themes)
4. Data display and interpretation
5. Conclusion drawing and verification

Thematic analysis is widely recognized as a rigorous and flexible technique for identifying patterns in qualitative data (Nowell et al., 2017; Tracy, 2020). Cross-source comparison between interviews and documents strengthened analytical consistency (Yin, 2018).

Trustworthiness and Rigor

To enhance methodological rigor, the study adopted several trustworthiness strategies (Tracy, 2020; Creswell & Creswell, 2018):
1. Credibility: Data triangulation (interviews and documents)
2. Dependability: Transparent documentation of procedures

3. Confirmability: Reflexive field notes and audit trail
4. Transferability: Thick description of context and governance setting

Additionally, selected interview summaries were member-checked with informants to validate interpretations.

Ethical Considerations

Ethical procedures were strictly observed. All participants provided informed consent prior to interviews. Informants were assured of confidentiality, anonymity, and voluntary participation. Identifiers were replaced with coded labels to protect identities. Ethical compliance is essential in qualitative research involving human participants, particularly when discussing governance practices and institutional processes (Tracy, 2020; Flick, 2018).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Results

This section presents the empirical findings of the study on governance challenges in road and bridge infrastructure development in Kokas District, Fakfak Regency, Indonesia. The results are derived from semi-structured in-depth interviews with 15 purposively selected informants and supported by document analysis of development planning reports, project implementation records, and administrative accountability documents. Interviews were conducted between March and April 2025. To ensure confidentiality, informants are identified using coded labels reflecting their institutional roles: government officials (G), district administrators (D), project implementers (P), and community representatives (C).

The findings are organized into four governance dimensions: institutional capacity, policy implementation processes, accountability mechanisms, and stakeholder participation. While presented separately for analytical clarity, the results reveal strong interconnections among these dimensions.

Institutional Capacity in Road and Bridge Infrastructure Governance

Institutional capacity emerged as a dominant theme across interviews. Informants consistently highlighted constraints related to human resources, technical expertise, administrative workload, and organizational coordination.

A senior official from the Public Works Office (G1) explained:

"The number of technical personnel is not proportional to the scale of infrastructure responsibilities. We handle multiple road and bridge projects, yet only a few staff have specialized engineering or supervisory expertise."

Similarly, a field supervisor (P2) noted:

"One officer often oversees several projects simultaneously. This affects the frequency of site visits and limits detailed technical monitoring."

These statements were corroborated by project supervision documents indicating that technical officers were assigned overlapping responsibilities across geographically dispersed sites. Such conditions align with governance literature emphasizing that administrative effectiveness depends on adequate professional capacity and organizational support (Peters, 2018; Andrews, Pritchett, & Woolcock, 2017).

District administrators described the operational consequences of limited staffing. Informant D2 stated:

"Coordination meetings, reporting obligations, and community consultations compete for limited time. Infrastructure programs are important, but administrative demands are overwhelming."

Beyond staffing limitations, informants identified skills mismatches. A project implementer (P3) remarked:

"Some personnel are assigned to technical functions without sufficient training in road construction standards or contract supervision."

Document analysis of district planning reports revealed that capacity-building initiatives were mentioned in policy narratives but lacked detailed implementation strategies, timelines, or budget allocations. This gap suggests that institutional strengthening remains more aspirational than operational.

Policy Implementation Processes
The second governance dimension concerns the translation of infrastructure policies into concrete development activities. Informants acknowledged the existence of formal planning frameworks but emphasized persistent challenges in execution.

A government official (G2) stated:

"Planning documents are comprehensive, but implementation often encounters delays caused by administrative procedures and coordination complexities."

Inter-agency coordination was repeatedly identified as a constraint. Informant P4 observed:

"Projects require alignment between district authorities, regency offices, and sometimes provincial units. Approval processes can be slow, especially when revisions are needed."

District-level administrators described coordination as procedurally structured yet practically fragmented. Informant D1 explained:

"Each agency operates within its mandate, but integration mechanisms are weak. Information sharing depends heavily on informal communication rather than institutionalized systems."

Budget disbursement delays further complicated implementation timelines. Informant P1 noted:

"Funds sometimes arrive later than scheduled. Contractors then compress work schedules, which may affect construction quality."

Project implementation records confirmed deviations between planned and actual completion dates, particularly for projects located in remote villages. Informants attributed these delays not only to administrative procedures but also to geographical constraints.

A contractor representative (P5) explained:

"Transporting materials is costly and time-consuming. Weather conditions and limited access routes create unpredictable delays."

These findings resonate with implementation theory, which emphasizes that policy success depends on administrative coordination, resource reliability, and contextual adaptation (Hill & Hupe, 2019). In Kokas District, standardized policy frameworks appeared insufficiently sensitive to logistical realities.

Accountability and Transparency Mechanisms
Accountability mechanisms were formally present but unevenly practiced. Informants acknowledged the existence of reporting systems, audits, and administrative supervision procedures.

Informant G3 stated:

"All infrastructure projects follow reporting requirements. Financial and progress reports are submitted regularly to higher authorities."

However, the orientation of accountability was predominantly upward, focusing on compliance with regulatory obligations. Downward accountability to communities was limited.

A community leader (C2) remarked:

"We rarely receive detailed information about project budgets or timelines. Usually, we only know when construction starts."

Another community representative (C4) stated:

"When delays occur, explanations are minimal. The community feels excluded from monitoring processes."

Document analysis supported these perceptions. Accountability reports emphasized financial absorption rates, administrative compliance, and technical progress but provided limited evidence of public dissemination or participatory oversight. This pattern reflects broader governance critiques suggesting that accountability systems in decentralized contexts often prioritize procedural compliance over transparency and citizen engagement (Bovens, Goodin, & Schillemans, 2017; Lodge & Hood, 2016).

Some informants acknowledged emerging transparency efforts. Informant D3 noted:

"There have been attempts to improve public information sharing, but these are not yet systematic."

Despite formal structures, the perceived opacity of project information contributed to community skepticism. Informants described trust as contingent upon visible outcomes rather than institutional communication.

Stakeholder Participation in Infrastructure Development

Stakeholder participation emerged as the weakest governance dimension. Informants consistently described participation mechanisms as procedural rather than substantive.

Informant C1 explained:

"Community meetings are typically conducted after project plans are finalized. Suggestions are heard but rarely influence decisions."

Similarly, Informant C3 stated:

"Participation feels symbolic. Communities are informed, not actively involved."

Government officials acknowledged structural limitations. Informant G4 noted:

"Time constraints and administrative procedures limit deeper community engagement, especially during early planning stages."

District administrators emphasized that participation often occurs through socialization sessions designed to inform communities rather than co-create decisions. Informant D2 observed:

"Participation is implemented to fulfill regulatory requirements, but meaningful deliberation is still limited."

These findings align with participatory governance literature distinguishing between tokenistic consultation and genuine engagement (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2019; Ansell & Torfing, 2021). Limited participation may reduce community ownership and long-term infrastructure sustainability.

Integrated Perspectives Across Governance Dimensions

Across interviews, informants emphasized that governance challenges are interconnected. Limited institutional capacity constrained supervision and coordination; weak coordination contributed to implementation delays; limited transparency affected accountability perceptions; and minimal participation reduced community trust.

Informant G1 summarized:

"Infrastructure challenges are not only technical. Governance factors such as staffing, coordination, and communication are equally decisive."

Similarly, Informant P2 observed:

"When supervision is limited, quality control becomes difficult. This can create downstream problems."

Community representatives linked participation deficits to accountability concerns. Informant C2 remarked:

"If communities are not involved, they cannot monitor or support projects effectively."

Table 1. Summary of Governance Challenges Identified from Interviews

Governance Dimension	Key Findings	Informant Consensus
Institutional Capacity	Limited human resources and technical expertise	High
Policy Implementation	Weak inter-agency coordination and budget delays	High
Accountability	Formal reporting exists, limited transparency	Moderate
Stakeholder Participation	Low community involvement in planning and evaluation	High

Source: Research Results, 2025.

Document Analysis Insights

Documentary evidence reinforced interview findings. Development planning reports articulated governance principles such as transparency, coordination, and participation. However, project records and monitoring reports revealed inconsistencies between policy narratives and operational practices.

For example:
1. Capacity development programs lacked measurable indicators
2. Coordination mechanisms were not institutionalized
3. Transparency provisions were weakly implemented
4. Participation processes emphasized compliance rather than engagement

These discrepancies illustrate the gap between formal governance frameworks and field realities, a phenomenon widely discussed in governance and public administration research (OECD, 2020; World Bank, 2021).

Emerging Adaptive Practices

Despite challenges, informants identified adaptive practices. Some agencies increased informal coordination, while project implementers adjusted schedules to logistical constraints.

Informant P4 noted:

"Field-level actors often rely on informal collaboration to resolve administrative bottlenecks."

District administrators described incremental learning. Informant D1 stated:

"There is growing awareness of governance issues, but structural improvements require long-term commitment."

Discussion

This study examined governance challenges in road and bridge infrastructure development in Kokas District through four analytical dimensions: institutional capacity, policy implementation processes, accountability mechanisms, and stakeholder participation. The findings demonstrate that infrastructure development constraints are deeply embedded in administrative and governance dynamics rather than being attributable solely to technical or financial limitations. This discussion situates the empirical results within broader theoretical debates on governance, decentralization, and public sector performance.

Institutional Capacity and Decentralized Governance

Institutional capacity emerged as a foundational constraint shaping infrastructure governance in Kokas District. Limitations in human resources, technical expertise, and administrative workload significantly affected planning quality, supervision intensity, and project coordination. These findings reinforce the argument that decentralization reforms presuppose, but do not guarantee, adequate subnational administrative capacity (Andrews, Pritchett, & Woolcock, 2017). In practice, capacity deficits weaken the ability of local governments to perform complex managerial and regulatory functions associated with infrastructure development.

From a public administration perspective, institutional capacity is not merely a matter of staffing numbers but encompasses professional competence, organizational stability, and knowledge systems (Peters, 2018). The skills mismatches and overlapping responsibilities identified in this study illustrate structural capacity gaps that constrain governance effectiveness. This supports Grindle's (2017) critique that governance reforms often overemphasize formal institutional arrangements while underestimating implementation capacity.

Moreover, the findings highlight the uneven territorial distribution of administrative resources commonly observed in decentralized systems (Smoke, 2018). Remote districts such as Kokas face compounded disadvantages, including limited access to specialized expertise and logistical barriers that intensify administrative burdens. Consequently, decentralization may reproduce governance inequalities when capacity-building measures are insufficiently targeted.

Policy Implementation and Coordination Failures

The study reveals a persistent gap between formal policy frameworks and operational realities. Although planning documents articulated clear development priorities, implementation processes were frequently disrupted by coordination delays, budget disbursement uncertainties, and logistical constraints. These findings align with policy implementation theory, which emphasizes that successful policy execution depends on inter-organizational coordination, resource reliability, and adaptive administrative practices (Hill & Hupe, 2019).

Fragmented coordination among district, regency, and provincial actors suggests that decentralization has dispersed authority without establishing sufficiently robust integrative mechanisms. Pierre and Peters (2020) argue that governance effectiveness in multi-level systems depends on coordination architectures capable of aligning institutional mandates and information flows. In Kokas

District, reliance on informal communication rather than institutionalized coordination structures contributed to procedural inefficiencies.

Budget delays further illustrate the vulnerability of implementation processes to administrative rigidities. Consistent with World Bank (2021) analyses, delayed disbursement compresses project timelines, often leading to rushed execution and compromised quality. Importantly, geographical isolation magnified these challenges. Standardized policy instruments did not fully account for the district's logistical realities, reinforcing Peters' (2018) contention that governance arrangements must be context-sensitive rather than universally applied.

Accountability: Compliance versus Transparency

Accountability mechanisms in Kokas District were characterized by strong procedural compliance but limited transparency and public dissemination. Reporting systems primarily served upward accountability functions directed toward higher administrative levels. This pattern reflects Bovens, Goodin, and Schillemans' (2017) distinction between formal accountability and substantive accountability. While formal compliance ensures adherence to regulations, it does not necessarily enhance transparency, learning, or citizen oversight.

The limited availability of project information reported by community informants indicates a deficit in downward accountability. Lodge and Hood (2016) note that accountability systems emphasizing hierarchical reporting may inadvertently marginalize public-oriented transparency. In infrastructure governance, insufficient transparency may undermine public trust and restrict opportunities for participatory monitoring (OECD, 2021).

These findings also resonate with Grindle's (2017) argument that accountability reforms in developing contexts often prioritize administrative control and auditability over communicative transparency. The emphasis on financial absorption and procedural conformity observed in this study illustrates how accountability practices may become technocratic rather than socially responsive.

Stakeholder Participation and Symbolic Engagement

Stakeholder participation emerged as the weakest governance dimension. Participation mechanisms were predominantly procedural, with community involvement occurring after major planning decisions had been finalized. This supports Denhardt and Denhardt's (2019) observation that participatory governance may be implemented as symbolic consultation rather than genuine deliberative engagement.

Participatory governance theory emphasizes that early and substantive citizen involvement enhances policy legitimacy, responsiveness, and sustainability (Ansell & Torfing, 2021). However, the findings indicate that participation in Kokas District functioned largely as information-sharing rather than co-creation. This limited influence on decision-making processes may weaken community ownership and long-term infrastructure maintenance.

The participation deficit also intersects with accountability challenges. Without access to information and meaningful engagement opportunities, communities are constrained in performing oversight roles (OECD, 2020). Thus, participation and transparency should be understood as mutually reinforcing governance mechanisms rather than isolated principles.

Interconnected Governance Constraints

A key contribution of this study lies in demonstrating the interdependence of governance dimensions. Institutional capacity limitations weakened supervision and coordination; coordination failures disrupted implementation timelines; limited transparency affected accountability perceptions; and weak participation reduced community trust. These interconnections reflect Pierre and Peters' (2020) governance perspective, which conceptualizes public sector performance as shaped by interacting institutional and relational factors.

The findings challenge linear reform assumptions suggesting that improvements in single governance dimensions automatically yield better outcomes. Instead, the evidence supports Andrews et al.'s (2017) argument for problem-driven iterative adaptation, emphasizing context-specific and systemic governance strengthening strategies.

Implications for Decentralization and Infrastructure Governance

The results carry important implications for decentralized governance systems. First, decentralization without sustained investment in institutional capacity risks producing administrative overload and uneven governance performance (Smoke, 2018). Second, coordination architectures must be strengthened to align multi-level actors and reduce implementation fragmentation (Hill & Hupe, 2019). Third, accountability systems should expand beyond compliance to include transparency, communication, and public engagement (Bovens et al., 2017). Finally, participatory mechanisms must be institutionalized throughout the policy cycle rather than confined to procedural consultation stages (Ansell & Torfing, 2021).

For remote districts, governance reforms must explicitly incorporate geographic and logistical realities. As OECD (2020) emphasizes, infrastructure governance frameworks should integrate flexibility, local knowledge, and adaptive administrative practices.

Theoretical Contribution

This study examined governance challenges in road and bridge infrastructure development in Kokas District, Fakfak Regency, Indonesia, by focusing on institutional capacity, policy implementation, accountability mechanisms, and stakeholder participation. The findings reveal that This study contributes to governance and public administration literature by providing empirical evidence from a remote district context often underrepresented in infrastructure governance research. While existing scholarship frequently focuses on national-level policies or megaprojects, this study highlights how governance dynamics manifest at the district level under capacity-constrained conditions (World Bank, 2023). The findings reinforce the relevance of governance theory, implementation theory, and participatory governance frameworks in explaining infrastructure development outcomes.

CONCLUSION

Conclusion

This study highlights that the effectiveness of road and bridge infrastructure development in remote districts is fundamentally shaped by governance conditions embedded within local administrative systems. By situating infrastructure development within a public administration framework, the research underscores that development outcomes are inseparable from institutional arrangements, coordination structures, accountability practices, and participatory mechanisms. The case of Kokas District illustrates how governance dynamics influence not only project execution but also the broader credibility, legitimacy, and sustainability of public investment.

The study contributes to governance and decentralization scholarship by demonstrating that infrastructure challenges in peripheral regions should be understood as systemic administrative phenomena rather than isolated operational issues. Decentralized governance structures create opportunities for locally responsive development, yet these opportunities remain contingent upon the alignment of authority, capacity, and accountability. The findings therefore reinforce the theoretical proposition that governance quality functions as a mediating variable between policy intent and development performance.

From a public administration perspective, this research emphasizes the importance of moving beyond technocratic and compliance-oriented views of infrastructure management. Infrastructure provision represents a governance-intensive domain requiring adaptive institutions, collaborative coordination, transparent decision-making, and inclusive engagement. Strengthening these dimensions is critical for ensuring that infrastructure investments translate into equitable access, service reliability, and long-term regional development.

Recommendation

Improving the governance of road and bridge infrastructure development in remote districts requires a balanced combination of administrative improvements and institutional strengthening. First, enhancing institutional capacity should become a primary priority. Local governments need to invest in

developing staff competencies, particularly in technical supervision, project management, and contract administration. Strengthening human resources is essential to ensure that infrastructure programs are not only implemented but also effectively planned, monitored, and evaluated.

Second, greater attention must be given to improving inter-agency coordination. Infrastructure development involves multiple actors operating at district, regency, and sometimes provincial levels. Without clear coordination mechanisms and structured communication channels, policy implementation is likely to remain fragmented and inefficient. Establishing routine coordination forums and clarifying institutional roles can help reduce delays and administrative inconsistencies.

Third, transparency and accountability practices should be reinforced. Public access to information regarding infrastructure planning, budgeting, and implementation needs to be expanded. More open communication can enhance public trust, enable community oversight, and strengthen the legitimacy of development initiatives. Accountability mechanisms should therefore function not only as compliance instruments but also as tools for transparency and institutional learning.

Fourth, stakeholder participation should be made more meaningful. Community involvement must extend beyond formal consultation and socialization activities. Engaging citizens in planning, monitoring, and evaluation processes can improve policy responsiveness, increase local ownership, and contribute to infrastructure sustainability. Participation should be embedded throughout the policy cycle rather than treated as a procedural requirement.

Fifth, infrastructure policies and administrative procedures should adopt a more context-sensitive orientation. Remote districts face distinct geographical and logistical constraints that require adaptive governance strategies. Recognizing these local realities can improve implementation effectiveness and reduce the mismatch between policy design and field conditions.

REFERENCES

Andrews, M., Pritchett, L., & Woolcock, M. (2017). *Building state capability: Evidence, analysis, action.* Oxford University Press.

Ansell, C., & Torfing, J. (2021). *Public governance as co-creation: A strategy for revitalizing the public sector.* Cambridge University Press.

Aspinall, E. (2020). Indonesia's decentralization and local governance dynamics. *Journal of Contemporary Asia, 50*(4), 1–19.

Bovens, M., Goodin, R. E., & Schillemans, T. (2017). *The Oxford handbook of public accountability.* Oxford University Press.

Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (5th ed.). Sage Publications.

Denhardt, J. V., & Denhardt, R. B. (2019). *The new public service: Serving, not steering* (5th ed.). Routledge.

Flick, U. (2018). *An introduction to qualitative research* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.

Flyvbjerg, B. (2017). Megaproject governance and the problem of risk. *Project Management Journal, 48*(6), 1–18.

George, A. L., & Bennett, A. (2016). *Case studies and theory development in the social sciences.* MIT Press.

Grindle, M. S. (2017). Good governance revisited. *Governance, 30*(1), 1–18.

Hill, M., & Hupe, P. (2019). *Implementing public policy: An introduction to the study of operational governance* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Lodge, M., & Hood, C. (2016). Accountability and governance in public administration. *Regulation & Governance, 10*(3), 1–14.

Nowell, L. S., Norris, J. M., White, D. E., & Moules, N. J. (2017). Thematic analysis in qualitative research. *International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 16*(1), 1–13.

OECD. (2020). *Infrastructure governance and public investment.* OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2021). *Government at a Glance 2021.* OECD Publishing.

Patton, M. Q. (2019). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods* (4th ed.). Sage Publications.

Peters, B. G. (2018). *The politics of bureaucracy: An introduction to comparative public administration* (7th ed.). Routledge.

Pierre, J., & Peters, B. G. (2020). *Governance, politics and the state* (2nd ed.). Palgrave Macmillan.

Smoke, P. (2018). Fiscal decentralization and service delivery. *Public Administration and Development, 38*(2), 1–10.

Tracy, S. J. (2020). *Qualitative research methods: Collecting evidence, crafting analysis, communicating impact.* Wiley-Blackwell.

Torfing, J., Peters, B. G., Pierre, J., & Sørensen, E. (2021). *Interactive governance: Advancing the paradigm.* Oxford University Press.

World Bank. (2017). *World Development Report 2017: Governance and the law.* World Bank Publications.

World Bank. (2021). *Well-spent: How strong infrastructure governance can end waste in public investment.* World Bank.

World Bank. (2023). *Public investment management and infrastructure governance.* World Bank.

Yin, R. K. (2018). *Case study research and applications: Design and methods* (6th ed.). Sage Publications.