International Journal of Engineering & Technology, 7 (4.38) (2018) 932-938

International Journal of Engineering & Technology

Website: www.sciencepubco.com/index.php/IJET

Research paper



The Influence of Government Policy on the Management of Border Conflict between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste

Petrus Kase, Lenny M. Tamunu, Chrisistomus E. Oiladang, Dhey W. Tadeus

Faculty of Social and Political Sciences
University of Nusa Cendana, Kupang, Indonesia
HP: +62-82146486969/WhatsApp: +62-082144953628
HP: 081339404326
**Corresponding author E-mail: teditadeus@yahoo.co.id*

Abstract

Although the government of Indonesia and Timor Leste have conducted a number of policy decisions and actions to manage border conflict between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste, the conflict remains unresolved and has the potential to continue. This study examines the influence of government policy on the management of border conflict between the two countries. Data obtained from questionnaires were analysed statistically descriptive, and through Pearson correlation and simple linear regression. The findings show that Indonesian government policy decisions and actions are slightly slow and less equal in acting on managing the border conflict, and less clear in implementing border line regulation between the two countries, but has high ability to prevent the conflict escalation. Customary figures who live in the border conflict region highly agree with and suggest to the government of both sides the use of customary law/oath as policy alternative in managing the conflict but the suggestion remains less responded well. This study also reveals that Indonesian government policy positively and moderately correlates, however, its influence on management of the border conflict is 33.5%. The government of Indonesia needs to improve its policy decisions and actions to manage the border conflict so that can prevent well the potential of the conflict continuation.

Keywords: *Government Policy, Border Conflict, Conflict Management*

1. Introduction

Harmoniuos and conflict situation among individuals, groups or states are like the two sides of a coin that are distinct from each other but can not be separated. These situations may happen any where and are unavoidable because they are important aspects of social interactions among human life itself. In terms of conflict situation, its presence has been demonstrated at the local, national and international level, individual with another individual or one group with another groups of society. One of the strong evidences is border conflict between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste. Conceptually, border disputes or conflicts are largely zero-sum games, a straightforward contest over territory among states or between states and non-state groups. They are notoriously difficult to resolve and often flare up when linked with important economic or social and political interests (the Charter Center, 2010). Contemporary condition shows that border conflict between Indonesia and Oecusse, District, Timor Leste and its potential continuation are important social and political issues, because it is unresolved yet completely and at one time it can reoccur in a larger scale and can result in a larger conflict violence among local community members in the border conflict areas. In this case, its negative impact on the social and econimic life of border community members from both sides of course will be real and an unavoidable as well.

Republic of Democratic Timor Leste (RDTL), called Timor Leste proclaimed its independence in 2002. In reality, in its foreign relationship with Indonesia, it experiences border conflict especially between Oecusse District and Kupang District and North Middle Timor District. Border conflict between these districts are located in villages including: (1) Haumeni Ana, North Middle Timor District, Indonesia with Passabe, Oecusse District, Timor Leste where border conflict happened on 31 July, 2012 because Timor Leste built Customs Office, Quarantine Office and Immigration Office in sterile zone and passed through the territory of Indonesia along 20 meters; (2) Nelu, North Middle Timor District, Indonesia with Leolbatan/Kosta, Oecusse District, Timor Leste where border conflict happened on 14 October, 2013 because Timor Leste built road along 500 meters in the territory of Indonesia and passed through sterile zone along 50 meters, destroyed state border pillars and nine ancestor cemeteries of Nelu citizens; (3) Bijaelsunan/Manusasi, North Middle Timor District, Indonesia with Oben, Oecusse District, Timor Leste where border conflict happened on 14 October, 2013 because Timor Leste occupied 142.7Ha of community land from Indonesian side; and (4) Naktuka/North Netemnanu, Kupang District, Indonesia with Citrana, Oecusse District, Timor Leste because Timor Leste occupied 1,069Ha of community land from Indonesian side as well (Hernandez, 2015; Kase and Tamunu, 2018).

Although the governments of Indonesia and Timor Leste have conducted a number of policy decisions and actions to manage the border conflict such as the determination of neutral/sterile zone in

Copyright © 2018 Authors. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

2005, law enforcement of Treaty and Agreement 1904 made by Duth and Portuguese, empowerment of border community members, and territorial pacification and building, their effectiveness are still questioned because border community members from Indonesian side consider that those policy decisions and actions are incompatible with their aspiration (Kase and Tamunu, 2018). This research aims to examine the influence of government policy on the management of border conflict between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste. In particular, it analyses statistically descriptive, correlation and regression of government policy on the management of border conflict between the two countries.

2. Theoretical Framework

A. Government policy

Conceptually, the term government and policy have different meaning, but practically they can be linked especially when the government makes and implements policies as one of its important functions in dealing with the societal problems. Government is an additional concept in the study of public policy, beside the other two additional concepts including politics and policy analysis. It refers to institutions and political processes through which public policy choices are made. It represents the legal authority to govern or rule a group of people. It includes the Congress, the president, the various agencies of the executive branch and the federal court system (Kraft and Furlong, 2007).

The term policy has been also scholarly defined in different perspective. Anderson (1994) offers a useful concept of policy as a purposive course of action followed by an actor or set of actors in dealing with a problem. This definition focusses on what is actually done instead of what is only proposed by the government. Birkland (2005) defines "a policy as a statement by government of what it intends to do or not to do such as a law, regulation, ruling, decision or order, or a combination of these." Hogwood and Gunn (1984), then propose a broader definition of policy in that it is as a label for a field of activity, expression of general purpose, specific proposals, decisions of government, formal authorization, a programme, output, outcome, a model and process.

An essential term that conceptually has close meaning to the term policy is public policy. Although discussion on this term can be confusing (Kraft and Furlong, 2007), political scientists offer many definitions to clarify its core meaning. Among them, Dye (1992) defines public policy as "whatever governments choose to do or not to do." They do many things starting from regulating behavior, organizing bureaucracies, distributing benefits or extracting taxes from society. Moreover, Peters (1999) points out public policy as the sum of government activities, whether acting directly or through agents, as it has an influence on the life of citizen. Finally, Kraft and Furlong (2007) put forward the definition of public policy as a course of government action or inaction in response to public problems. These authors also distinguish policy outputs and policy outcomes in that the former is the formal actions that governments take to pursue their goals and the later is the effects such actions actually have on society.

Policies or public policies which emerge from and endorsed by the government bodies or officials are essentially regarded as reflecting government policies even when they are effectively developed by a single department or inter-department. They essentially refer to government's attitude towards any aspect of public life and what the government proposes to do, or is doing, to tackle the public problems (Waller et al, 2009). A more specific definition of government policy is introduced by Obaji and Olugu (2014), who point out that government policy in the context of support policies for entrepreneurial development is any course of action which aims at regulating and improving the conditions of Small and Medium Scale Enterprises (SMEs) in terms of supportive, implementation and funding.

Furthermore, to build a better understanding on how and why government policies are made and implemented, and why some do better than others in policy debates and actual enactment (Birkland, 2005), it is necessary to look at classic policy types that have been developed by Theodore Lowi in 1964. In the modest terms, Lowi classifies policy into three main categories (Birkland, 2005) that are :

1. Distributive policies which involve "the granting of some sorts of benefits to a particular interest group or other well-defined relatively small group of beneficiaries."
2. Regulatory policies are intended to govern business conduct. These policies then are divided into two broad types that are : (1) competitive regulatory policies involve policies designed to "limit the provision of goods and services to one or a few designated deliverers," and (2) protective regulatory policies that are intended to regulate some activities to protect the public.
3. Redistributive policies are policies that give benefits to one group by imposing a dicernable cost on another groups.

In addition to the three main types of policy, Birkland (2005) proposes another four types of policy including : (1) procedural policy intended to determine procedures to the government to act; (2) substantive policy aiming to deliver goods and services; (3) material policy designed to provide a material; and (4) symbolic policy aiming to struggle for centain values such justice.

B. Conflict and Conflict Management

Sanginga and Kamugisha (2004) define conflict as a situation which involves people or social groups which have different interests, tend to be antagonistic and have contrary influence to use scarce resources to guarantee or increase their life. Manifestation, dimension and the level of its intensity varies significantly, implicit, explicit, local, regional, national and international violence. Sanginga and Kamugisha (2004) then define conflict management as a course of mechanism and institution to prevent and resolute dispute involving negotiation, avoidance, arbitration, conciliation, adjudication, compulsion or violence. Moreover, Rahim (2001) tries to distinguish the meaning of conflict resolution and conflict management. According to Rahim (2001) conflict resolution means conflict reduction, elimination and termination and has categories such as negotiation, bargaining, mediation and arbitration, while, conflict management must not involve conflict avoidance, reduction and termination, but effective strategic design to eliminate conflict and increase the constructive function of conflict to increase organization learning and effectiveness. Rahim (2001) explains that strategic design of effective conflict management involve five styles that are :

1. Integration style called "problem solving" describing high attention on himself/herself and others. This style expects collaboration among various parties through openness, information exchange, and investigation of differences to reach accepted resolution.
2. Obligation assisting style called "accommodating" describing low attention on himself/herself and high attention to others. This style tries to eliminate differences, but emphasizes togetherness to satisfy other party. It has the forms of generosity, charity, and obedience towards order from others.
3. Domination style called "competing" describing high attention to himself/herself but low attention to others. This style is oriented to win-lose by compulsion. Sometimes, someone like this wishes to win although make a sacrifice.
4. Avoidance style called "suppression" describing low attention on himself/herself and others. This style is like delaying issues or draw himself/herself from conflict situation.
5. Compromise style describes direct attention to himself/herself and others. This style involves give and take among both sides to end conflict and to make accepted decision.

Additionally, Rahim (2001) reclassifies the five styles of conflict management using the terminology of game theory. Therefore, integration style is classified into win-win style, compromise style is classified into no win-no lose style, assisting obligation style is classified into lose-win style, domination style is classified into win-lose style, and avoidance style is classified into lose-lose. In

general, integration and compromise style are appropriate to resolve complex problems, while the other three styles are appropriate to resolve routine and technical problems.

3. Research Method

This research uses causal correlation method to measure or test causal relationship between government policy (independent variable) and border conflict management (dependent variable). Research subjects (N=110) who were determined by using purposive sampling technique consisted of customary figures, society prominent figures, village government apparatus, district government of Kupang and North Middle Timor, and provincial government of East Nusa Tenggara. They were given questionnaires about government policy and border conflict management to be filled up. Questionnaires consisted of open and closed, dichotomy, multiple choices and multiple stages using Likert Scale. Questionnaires were reviewed critically by professionals including university lecturer staff and relevant non-governmental organizations to evaluate their reliabilities. When the reliability of the questionnaires had been agreed, then pretest was conducted with the members of border conflict communities in small number to test their content validity, application ease and relevance. Moreover, similar questionnaires were retested their level of reliability with former participants two weeks after. Result of pretest and retest were compared using coefficient Pearson and Spearman correlation. Questionnaires were examined their consistency between the second time retest and the first time pretest. Then, final questionnaires were given to the selected research subjects to be filled up. Moreover, data collected from questionnaires were coded, edited and processed by using SPSS to obtain their distribution frequency, analyse the data statistically descriptive, and measure or test the correlation and the influence of government policy (independent variable) on border conflict management (dependent variable).

4. Results and Discussion

A. Descriptive statistic of variable analysis

Border conflict between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste is not only social conflict between local community members but also international political conflict between the two countries. Therefore, governments of both sides are responsible to take particular policy actions to manage it so that social and political situation in the border areas of both countries become secure, peaceful and pleasing. In this case, government policy is indeed the most important policy among another government policies. Descriptive statistics regarding government policy and border conflict management between the two countries is presented in table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive statistics of variable analysis Entire sample (N=110)

Variable	*Mean*	*SD*
Independent variable : Government policy		
Rapidity in managing the border conflict areas	1.68	.741
Clarity in implementing regulations regarding border line of the two countries	1.92	.780
Fairness in managing the border conflict areas	1.94	.745
Ability to protect local community and prevent border conflict escalation and eruption	3.22	.871
Dependent variable : Border conflict management		
Negotiation	3.02	1.375
Compromise	3.05	1.371
Avoidance of the government of Indonesia	4.44	.565
Avoidance of the government of Timor Leste	4.28	.534
Arbitration	1.58	.780
Conciliation	2.81	1.289
Adjudication	1.31	.854
Physical compulsion by the government of Indonesia	1.29	.513
Psychological compulsion by the government of Indonesia	1.46	.820
Physical compulsion by the government of Timor Leste	1.26	.501
Psychological compulsion by the government of Timor Leste	1.26	.501
Customary law/oath	4.89	.313

Table 1 shows that the mean of each indicator of government policy such as conflict management speed is 1.68, clearness in implementing the existing regulations regarding border line of the two countries is 1.92, and equity in managing border conflict areas is 1.94, while government ability to protect local community members in border conflict areas and to prevent border conflict escalation and eruption is 3.22. These data are compatible with the fact that the government of Indonesia is slow in managing the border conflict, less clear in implementing regulations regarding border line of the two countries and less equal in managing the border conflict, however, it has high ability to protect local community members in border conflict areas and prevent the conflict continuation, escalation and eruption. Security apparatus such as policemen and armed forces who were placed in border conflict areas of the two countries and their effective performance are the determining factors in maintaining and calming down conflict situation between local community members of both sides.

In terms of the implementation of existing border line regulations of the two countries, several regulations can be referred to manage the border conflict. The regulations are Tractat and agreement 1904 on border line made by Dutch and Portuguese during colonial period, agreement of border pillar or sterile zone between Indonesia and Timor Leste in 2005, and customary law/oath that rely on social and cultural tradition of local society in the border regions between the two countries. As Lowi (1964) pointed out that regulation as one of the policy types function to govern the conduct of business or certain actors and in relation to the border conflict management, this type of policy of course governs the conduct of the government of Indonesia as a political-administrative actor to manage the border conflict between the two countries. However, in practice, the government of Indonesia is less clear in using those border line regulations mentioned above to manage the border conflict, because it seems to have very little data and information regarding the political history of the border line determination, and the power of social and cultural values of border society from both countries.

Moreover, although respons from the government of Indonesia in managing the border conflict is slow, this must not be considered as a solely negative action because border conflict between the two countries is a complex social and cultural, historical and political issue. The complexity of these issues in fact pushes the government of Indonesia to take very long considerations. The slow respon from the government of Indonesia to manage the border conflict might also because it still put the border conflict issue as not an agenda priority for policy action, while historical, political, social and cultural facts, especially customary law/oath issue

raised by border society members are not so powerful to convince it to act (Kase and Tamunu, 2018).

An important factor that needs to be considered by the government of Indonesia is the acknowledgement of district government of Kupang and North Middle Timor, customary figures and society prominent figures regarding the existence of customary law/oath of border society members of the two countries. According to these parties, the effectiveness of using customary law/oath in managing the border conflict should not be ignored because community members from both sides have similar custom and belief that the violation of the customary law/oath will result in disaster and death. Therefore, the use of customary law/oath in the border conflict management and resolution will be more effective than formal law that rely on government political and judicial rules. They suggest that the government of Indonesia and Timor Leste should apply customary law/oath to manage the border conflict, but this suggestion is not yet responded well (Kase and Tamunu, 2018).

Fair policy action by the government of Indonesia in determining border line in the border conflict areas is also important. There are several segments of border conflict that according to border community members of the two countries are unresolved yet equally, notably Bijaelsunan, Manusasi village and Haumeni Ana village, North Middle Timor District, and Naktuka, North Netemnanu village, Kupang District. According to them, the recent determination of border line is incompatible with 1904 Treaty and customary law that bind border society members from both sides. They expect th government of Indonesia to determine fairly border line at the border conflict areas. However, their expectation is not yet real (Kase and Tamunu, 2018). This fact indicates that the government has not yet provided the value of justice in determining the border line between the two countries and this fact is of course incompatible with the essence of distributive, substantive and symbolic types of policy.

Table 1 also shows that the mean of each indicator of the management of border conflict between the two countries such as arbitration is 1.58, adjudication is 1.31, physical compulsion by the government of Indonesia is 1.29, psychological compulsion by the government of Indonesia is 1.46, physical and psychological compulsion by the government of Timor Leste is 1.26, conciliation is 2.81, negotiation is 3.02, compromise is 3.05, customary law/oath is 4.89, avoidance of the government of Indonesia is 4.44, and avoidance of the government of Timor Leste is 4.28.

The above data means that subjects surveyed in this study disagree with arbitration, adjudication, physical and psychological compulsion by the government of Indonesia and Timor Leste, and agree enough with conciliation, however, agree with negotiation and compromise, and highly agree with the use of customary law/oath. They also highly agree that both the government of Indonesian and Timor Leste tend to avoid the attempt to manage the border conflict. This is indicated by the fact that the government of both sides tends to delay their policy decisions and actions in managing and resolving the border conflict. In relation to the disagreed indicators, the subjects surveyed in this study expect the government from both sides to not use arbitration, adjudication, physical and psychological compulsion in managing the border conflict because these types of conflict management will generate some unwillingness consequences such as partial decision making and social, psichological and political insecurity among border society from both sides. The strengths and the weaknesses of these types of border conflict management are explained by The Charter Center (2010) that adjudication outcome on border conflict issues is usually unpredictable, and political leaders are often unwilling to accept the risks of losing territory. Arbitration or mediation can also provide a more flexible and balanced way to reach a satisfactory outcome, but their finality makes politicians nervous. Adjudication and arbitration usually emphasize legal determinants of a border dispute, however, they sometimes consider equitable factors at the request of the parties, or apply relevant law most reasonably under the circumstances. Conciliation and other forms of facilitation by third parties may be more attractive, although they may be resisted by states with weak claims but strong political interests.

The above data also indicates that the highly agreed and the most positive way to manage the border conflict is the use of customary law/oath that rely on social and cultural tradition of society from both sides, meanwhile negotiation and compromise are another supporting solutions for the border conflict. This data means that social and cultural tradition is a valueable factor that must be considered and applied in managing the border conflict. The importance of social and cultural tradition at the local level, including the value level of customary law/oath in managing the border conflict between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste is further emphasized by Hogu Lourenco da Costa's research (2017) who found that lose and diminish of social and cultural values of border society between the two countries that are influenced by social and political interests of certain groups provide an impression as though the border conflict is increasingly complex to be managed. Therefore, similar social and cultural values of the two countries such as language, customary law/oath, religion and family ties have important role that need to be raised as alternative policy decisions and actions to manage the border conflict. The National Alternative Dispute Resolution Advisory Council (2006) also emphasizes that indigenous people and their customary factor at the local level need to be involved in the design and the delivery of dispute resolution and conflict management services, and services need to take into account their perspectives on disputes and their resolution. Moreover, Tadesse Berhe and Yonas Adaye's statement (2001) revealed that cross border ethnic solidarity indicated by a strong common ethnic identity along the borders of Afar in Ethiopia, Djibouti and Eritrea makes it easy for the Afar's resentment to transcend national frontiers and involve Afar communities in the three countries. This reality has been demonstrated in the past and in the present.B

B. Relationship among variables

Analysis of relationships among variables in this research used correlation and simple linear regression methods. Correlation analysis of government policy (independent variable) and border conflict management (dependent variable) explain the closeness, direction and relationship significance between these variables. Correlation and simple linear regression analysis of these variables are presented in table 2.

Table 2. Relationship of variable analysis

Government policy	**Border conflict management**	
	Correlation result	Regression result
Pearson Correlation	.579**	-
Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	-
Constant	-	20.767
SE	-	1.393
B	-	.769
t-count	-	7.379
Sig.	-	.000
R	-	.579[a]
R Square	-	.335
Adjusted R Square	-	.329
F	-	54.454
N	110	110

Output of correlation test product moment (Pearson Correlation) in table 2 shows that co-efficient correlation between government policy and border conflict management between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste is 0.579. Positive sign indicates that

the correlation is in the same direction which means that the higher the quality level of the government policy, the higher the quality level of border conflict management, and reversely, the lower the quality level of government policy, the lower the quality level of border conflict management. Based on such co-efficient correlation number and by referring to interpretation guidance regarding co-efficient correlation where the range between 0,000 – 0,199 is very weak, 0,200 – 0,399 is weak, 0,400 – 0,599 is moderate, 0,600–0,799 is strong, and 0,800–1.00 is very strong (Sugiyono, 2007), it can be concluded that correlation between government policy and border conflict management between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste is moderate.

Moreover, to determine correlation significance between government policy and border conflict management, from the correlation analysis, it is known that correlation significance is 0.000. Because this correlation significance is lower than 0.005, then zero hypotheses (Ho) is rejected. This means that there is correlation between government policy and border conflict management, however the correlation is positive and moderate which means that although the government of Indonesia has done several policy decisions and actions to manage the border conflict, their effectiveness are at moderate level because the border line in the border conflict areas has not been yet determined completely. Also although the border conflict does not tend to re-emerge and its escalation and eruption can be controlled because security apparatus in the border conflict areas are performing well and successful in maintaining and calming down the conflict situation, local society members are less satisfied with the government policy decisions and actions because they recognice that the recent government policy decisions and actions to manage the conflict are slow, less clear and less equal. In relation to this local society unsatisfation regarding the government management result of the border conflict, Kolne'study (2014) revealed that in terms of implementaion disposition, there still exists public ignorance on the government policy outcomes in the management of the border conflict, because the government policy outcomes in the management of the border conflict is incompatible with the society aspiration and expectation.

In addition to the correlation analysis described above, this research also uses simple linear regression analysis to explains the influence of government policy (indipendent variable) on border conflict management between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste (dependent variable) and to explain how the pattern of the border conflict management (dependent variable - criteria) can be predicted by the change of the government policy (independent variable - predictor). Result of simple linear regression analysis is also presented in table 2 and is explained as follows.

From co-efficent output table, regression analysis of government policy with border conflict management between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste can be done by using equation format of simple linear regression analysis:

$\acute{Y} = a+bX$

Where,

$\acute{Y}$ = predicted value of Y, dependent variable (border conflict management between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste)

a = constant or Y intercept, b = regression co-efficient or slope, and X = independent variable (predictor) (government policy). If simple regression co-efficient value that exist on co-efficient output table is entered into simple linear regression equation format, the result is:

$Y = 20.767 + 0.769 X$

Where,

The constant is 20.767 indicates that if government policy is zero, border conflict management between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste is 20.767. Co-efficient b = 0.769 indicates that if government policy increases one point, border conflict management between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste will also increase 0.769 point.

From the output table 2, it can also be known that R^2 (R Square) value is 0.335. This means that the influence of government policy on border conflict management between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste is 33.5 % while the residue 66.5% is influenced by other factors that does not examined in this study. We consider that the other factors might be weak government leadership, weak commitment and priority politics of government from the two countries to manage well the border conflcit, less attention of government from the two countries regarding the importance of social and cultural similarity of local community in the border conflict areas of the two countries, and inadequate data regarding administrative and political history of border line agreement since Dutch and Portuguese colonization, within Indonesian occupation from 1976-1999. In relation to the above mentioned factors, Kolne's study (2014) revealed that in terms of bureaucratic structure, central government was still lack of supervision for the implementing institutions/agencies, performed poor coordination with the lower level government, and senior level government officials also did not involve the lower level government and local border communities in setting the boundaries. Also in terms of, resources dimensions there were still lack of supporting infrastructures and budget capacity available for lower level government and local border community in managing the border conflict region.

Moreover, t-test to examine the significance of constant and independent variable can be formulated by hypotheses:

Ho : b = 0, Means that government policy has no influence on border conflict management between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste

Ha: b ≠ 0, Means that government policy has an influence on border conflict management between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste

Significance level used in this research is 0.05. From the output data on table 2, calculation of t-count is 7.379. Furthermore, t-table can be found from statistic table in 0.05 significance with df = n-2 or 110 – 2 = 108. With two sides test, it can be obtained t-table 1.982. From calculation result of t-count and t-table, it is known that t-count (7.379) > t-table (1.982), so zero hypotheses is rejected. The conclusion is that government policy has an influence on the management of border conflict between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste, and its influence is positive because co-efficient and t-count is positive, which means that if the quality level of government policy decisions and actions increases, the quality level of management of the border conflict between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste will also increase. The quality level of government policy decisions and actions in the management of the border conflict between the two countries can also be determined by the quality level of policy actors, policy resources and institutional rules. If the quality level of policy actors, policy resources, and institutional rules is high, the quality level of government policy and the management of border conflict between the two countries will be also high.

The concept of these key policy analysis is explained by Peter Knoepfel et al. (2007) in that in term of policy actors, policy as a series of decisions or activities embody the results of interactions between different actors such political-administrative actors (administrative excecutive, member of parliament), socio-economic actors (private company, association and so on) or social-cultural actors (target group, and beneficiaries and so on). Peter Knoepfel et al (2007) also pointed out that the availability of different resources in the policy process, their production, management, exploitation, combination and even their substitution or exchange can exert significant influence on the processes, results and effects of a policy. The different types of the policy resources include law or legal resource, personnel or human resource, money or financial resource, information or cognitive resource, consensus or confidence resource, time or temporal resource, infrastructure or property resource, political support or majority resource, and force

or violent resource. Finally, institutional rules means specific ways that influence individual policy actors and the conduct of public policies. Institutional rules include social norm or cultural approach, voluntary contract norm and state structure. Institutional rules then can be refferred to neo-institutionalist school of thought which emphasizes four arguments such as opportunistic calculation and institutional heritage, social demand and structural barriers, external pressure and internal mediation, and ideological paradigm shift.

5. Conclusion

The government of Indonesia has taken a number of policy decisions and actions to manage border conflict between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste, however, it still slow, less clear and less equal in managing the border conflict. An important policy action of the government of Indonesia that must be acknowledged and appreciated is its ability through its security apparatus placed in the border conflict areas of the two countries to maintain and calm down the continuation and escalation of the border conflict situation. This research also found that the highly agreed and suggested types of border conflict management is the use of customary law/oath, followed by negotiation and compromise. On the contrary, the disagreed and unexpected types of border conflict management between the two countries are arbitration, adjudication, physical and psychological compulsion by the government of both sides. Correlation and simple linear regression analysis in this study also explains that government policy decisions and actions have positive and moderate correlation and influence on the management of border conflict between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste. In particular, the contribution of influence of govermnent policy decisions and actions on the management of border conflict between the two countries is 33.5 %. Such percentage is not so high which means that many other factors still play important roles in influencing the management of border conflict between the two countries.

The government of Indonesia should increase the quality level and value of its policy decisions and actions in order to increase the quality level and the value of the management of border conflict between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste. In particular, it should shortly manage the border conflict of the two countries in oder to avoid or diminish the potential of border conflict continuation, escalation and eruption in the future by considering simultaneously the speed, clearness, equity and existing regulations regarding border line determination between the two countries according to both historical and political agreement, customary law/oath, negotiation and compromise, however, should avoid using the types of policy decision and actions, and the types of conflict management that are incompatible with the aspiration of local community members in the border conflict region. Further research is necessary to examine another influential factor on the management of border conflict between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste by using either quantitative or qualitative approach or mixed method.

Acknowledgment

The authors would like to thank the Indonesian Ministry of Research, Technology and Higher Education, and the Research Institution of the University of Nusa Cendana for providing managerial and financial support to undertake this research. We also appreciate the comments from reviewers in improving the article for further publication.

References

[1] Amer, Ramses & Thao, Nguyen Hong.2009. Regional Confl ict Management: Challenges of the Border Disputes of Cambodia, Laos, and Vietnam. South-East Asian Studies - www.SEAS.at

[2] Ansyari, Syahrul & Nadlir, Moh. 2016. Sejarah Munculnya Sengketa Wilayah Indonesia- Timor Leste. http://nasional.news.viva.co.id/news/read/725771

[3] Berhe, Tadesse and Adaye, Yonas . 2001. The Impact of Local Conflict on National Stability. Published by the Institute for Security Studies. PO Box 1787, Brooklyn Square, 0075, (Tshwane) Pretoria, South Africa

[4] Birkland, T. A. 2005. An Introduction to the policy process : theories, concepts and models of public policy making (2nd ed.).M.E. Sharpe. London, England.

[5] Chopra, K., Leemans, R., Kumar, P., & Simons, H. 2005. Ecosystems and human well-being : policy responses : findings of the Responses Working Group of the Millennium Ecosystem Assessment (Volume 3). ISLAND PRESS. Washington.

[6] Coakley, John. 2017. Resolving International Border Disputes: The Irish Experience. Published in Cooperation and Conflict, 17 Jan. (Online First);
DOI: 10.1177/0010836716684881

[7] Creswell, J. W. 2013. Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches. Sage Publication Inc. London.

[8] da Costa, Hugo Lourenco. 2017. Kebijakan alternatif bagi penyelesaian masalah perbatasan antara Pemerintah Indonesia dan Timor Leste ditinjau dari aspek budaya. Tesis. Program Pascasarjana Universitas Nusa Cendana, Kupang.

[9] Dye, T. R. 2002. Understanding public policy. Prentice Hall. New Jersey.

[10] Fenn, Peter & Gameson, Rod. 1992. Construction Conflict Management and Resolution. E & FN SPON. London.

[11] Fenn, Peter., O'Shea, Michael. & Davies, Edward. 1998. Dispute Resolution and Conflict Management in Construction: An international review. E & FN Spon, An imprint of Routledge. London.

[12] Hernandez, Burhan. 2015. Analisa Konflik Perbatasan Indonesia – Timor Leste. http://www.kompasiana.com/www.burhanhernandez.com/analisa-konflik-perbatasan-indonesia-timor-leste_5559e93ab67e610c7dd366af

[13] Hogwood, Brian W. And Gunn, Lewis A. 1984. Policy Analysis for the Real World. The United States : Oxford University Press.

[14] Kase, Petrus and Tamunu, Lenny. M. 2018. Government Policy in the Management of Border Conflict Between Indonesia and Oecusse District, Timor Leste. Article published in Part of series : Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research. Proceedings of the International Conference on Public Policy, Social Computing and Development 2017 (ICOPOSDev 2017). Publication date : January 2018 ISBN : 978-94-6252-455-2 ISSN : 2352-5398

[15] Kolne, Yakobus. 2014. Implementasi perjanjian perbatasan RI – RDTL dalam upaya penyelesaian masalah perbatasan (studi kasus di Kabupaten TTU – RI dengan Distrik Oecusse-RDTL). Politika. Vol. 5, No. 1, Oktober 2014

[16] Kraft, M. E., & Furlong, S. R. 2007. Public policy : politics, analysis and alternatives (2nd ed.). CO Press. Washington, D.C.

[17] Knoepfel, Peter., Larrue, Corinne., Varone, Frederic & Hill Michael.2007. Public Policy Analysis. The Policy Press University of Bristol. UK.

[18] Lyons, Terrence & Khadiagala, Gilbert, M. 2008. Conflict Management and African Politics : Ripeness, bargaining, and mediation. Routledge. New York.

[19] Milles, B. M., & Huberman, A. M. 1992. Qualitative data analysis. Sage Publication Inc. Thousand Oaks.

[20] Moleong, Lexy J. 2007. Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif. PT Remaja Rosdakarya. Bandung.

[21] Obaji, Nkem Okpa, & Olugu, Mercy Uche. 2014. The role of government policy in entrepreneurship development.Science Journal of Business and Management. Vol. 2, No. 4, 2014, pp. 109-115. doi: 10.11648/j.sjbm.20140204.12

[22] Pal, L. A. 2006. Beyond Policy Analysis : Public Issue Management in Turbulence Time (3rd Ed.). Thomson Nelson. Canada.

[23] Pammer, William J., & Killian, Jr. Jerri. 2003. Handbook of Conflict Management. Wright State University. Dayton, Ohio, U.S.A.

[24] Rahim, M. Afzalur. 2001. Managing Conflict in Organizations (Third Edition). London : QUORUM BOOKS.

[25] Sanginga, Pascal, C., Kamugisha, N. Rick, & Martin, Andrienne M. 2007. The Dynamics of Social Capital and Conflict Management in Multiple Resource Regimes: A Case of the Southwestern Highlands of Uganda. Ecology and Society 12(1): 6. [online] URL: http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol12/iss1/art6/

[26] Simmons, Beth A. 1999. Territorial Disputes and Their Resolution : The Case of Ecuador and Peru. Washington, DC : United States Institute of Peace
[27] Subar. 2016. Implementasi Strategi Pengamanan dan Pembinaan Teritorial Perbatasan Republik Indonesia dengan Republik Demokratik Timor Leste (Studi Kasus Perbatasan Kecamatan Amfoang Timur Kabupaten Kupang. Tesis. Program Pascasarjana Universitas Nusa Cendana, Kupang.
[28] Sugiyono. 2013. Metode penelitian kombinasi (mixed methods). Penerbit Alfabeta. Bandung.
[29] Suryanto. 2009. Deplu Survei Perbatasan RI-Timor Leste. http://www.antaranews.com/berita/152327/deplu-survei-perbatasan-ri-timor-leste
[30] The Charter Center. 2010. Approaches to Solving Territorial Conflicts : Sources, Situations, Scenarios, and Suggestions. One Copenhill 453 Freedom Parkway, Atlanta, GA 30307 www.cartercenter.org
[31] The National Alternative Dispute Resolution Advisory Council (NADRAC). 2006. Indigenous Dispute Resolution and Conflict Management. Robert Garran Offices, BARTON ACT 2600. Phone 02 6250 6272 Fax 02 6250 5980. e-mail nadrac@ag.gov.au or visit NADRAC's web-site : www.nadrac.gov.au
[32] Timor Express. 2016. Lembaga Pemangku Adat (LPA) Amfoang Gelar Musyawarah Agung. Kupang. 04 May
[33] Waller, Peter., Morris R.M. & Simpson, Duncan.2009. Understanding the Formulation and Development of Government Policy in the context of FOI. Prepared for the Information Commissioner's Office by The Constitution Unit. London's Global University.