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Abstract. The spatial planning policy as included in the Local Regulation No. 6/2006 on the spatial planning of Makassar in 2005-2015 has changed from the original blueprint. The policy changing occurred on decisions or programs, but not on institutional regulations. The decisions or programs on spatial planning that were different from the original policy were visible on the licensing decisions in the Development Region I and Development Region III. The purpose of this research was to analyze the changing of the spatial planning policy that was resulted from the behavior of the advocacy coalition who competed with each other in the utilization of strategy and political resources, which was assumed to be affecting the policy output. The study results indicated that the changing of the spatial planning policy in Makassar was resulted from the competition between the major advocacy coalition and the minor advocacy coalition in influencing the policy. The Major Advocacy Coalition used the combination of strategy and political resources more in comparison to the minor advocacy coalition. The utilization of strategy from each advocacy coalitions was effective in several cases but ineffective in other cases. The difference in the effectiveness of the utilization of strategy was on the interests in each cases. In the projects that were based on public interests, the Major Coalition was more systematic in advocating the policy core beliefs, but in other projects that were based on private interests, the Major Coalition was likely to withdraw.
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INTRODUCTION

In the past two decades, the public administration studies paid serious attention to the changing of policies during the implementation process. This was in line with the viewpoint in the public administration literature that viewed policy changing as the evolutionary process where the government programs were constantly reformed and redefined (Hill & Hupe, 2002; Pulzl & Treib, 2007). The implementation was not merely on how to implement the policy or creating an organization structure that could perform well. The characteristics of multi-locus, multi-layer, and multi-level in the policy implementation tend to create both competition and conflict between the actors involved and, in turn, affect both the reformation and the redefinition of the policy goals. (Hill & Hupe, 2002)

The tendency occurred mainly because of the dissatisfaction toward the impacts of public policies on the aspect of public life during the previous decade. Although the central government had implemented various distributive, redistributive, and regulative policies, the public problems in the aspects of economy, social, and politics, as well as other aspects, would continuously increase both in terms of quantity and complexity.

Most of the studies on the policy changing during the implementation process within public administration studies used the perspective of advocacy coalition competition. One of the theories that was included in the perspective was the Advocacy Coalition Framework.
(ACF), which stated that the policy changing occurred mainly as the consequence of the competition between the advocacy coalitions in the policy subsystem. Each advocacy coalitions tried to interpret their policy core beliefs to the government programs by increasing political resources. In addition, the ACF was designed to manage policy problems and decision situation that was marked with the high level of normative conflict and technical uncertainty toward a large number of actors among the government (Weible, Sabatier, and McQueen, 2009, Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 2007; Floraet al, 2007; Sabatier, 1991).

In explaining the changing of the spatial planning policy in Makassar, this research paper used the Advocacy Coalition Framework (ACF) theory from Sabatier and Jenkins Smith in both analyzing and verifying why the policy changes occurred, with the focus on the behavior of the coalition in utilizing the combination of strategy and political resources in influencing the spatial planning policy in Makassar. Based on the results of observation, the researcher found three government policies in the spatial planning of Makassar that were altered from the original blueprint, namely: (1) The licensing process of building construction permits (IMBs) and beach reclamation on national space. Changes occurred on the Presidential Regulation (Perpres) No 55/2001 on the City Spatial Planning. These locations were situated on national space (Makassar, Maros, Sungguminasa, and Takalar—abbreviated as Mamminasata) and located on beach borders, but the local government still issued building construction permits (IMBs) based on the Makassar Local Regulation (Perda) No 15/2004 on Building Use and the Makassar Mayoral Regulation No 8/2008 on Border Lines and Building Function on the Roads in Makassar, which were conflicted with the Perpres No 55/2001. (2) The decision from the Makassar Government to revitalize the Karebosi Square in 2007. At the time, the Makassar Government made a deal with one of the biggest companies in Makassar to conduct the revitalization with Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) contract for as many as 1,200 stalls with a contract period of 30 years. Even though the project was challenged by the legislature, the revitalization operation of the Karebosi Square was still implemented. Recently, a group of Makassar residents filed a lawsuit to the Makassar Government through legal procedures in the court system. Because of the lawsuit, the South Sulawesi Chapter of the National Land Agency (BPN) did not issue the Right to Manage (HPL) certificate while HPL was fundamental for the issuance of Lease Hold or the Right to Build (HGB). Subsequently, on November 20, 2010, the Supreme Court rejected the lawsuit from the Makassar residents through the court’s Cassation Verdict No. 366/2010. However, the BPN did not issue the HPL certificate because, according to the officials, there were no relevant regulations. (3) In the integrated higher education area, there was a conflict on the building permit (IMB) of Mall Plaza Tamalanrea. The reason of the shifting that sparked both the horizontal and vertical conflicts was the pressure from the politicians and the residents in the region to discontinue the construction of Mall Plaza Tamalanrea because of licensing issues and the project itself would trigger traffic congestion and disturbing the residents nearby. The Makassar Regulation No 6/2006 stated that the integrated higher education area was geared to boost its function as the center for higher education and thus limiting utilization activities that conflicting with the main function of the area, as well encouraging the rise of spaces that would support the area. These three phenomenons occurred in the Development Region I and the Development Region III of Makassar. These development regions were selected as the research resolution as both the specification of the ACF idea from Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith (2009). In addition, both development regions also met the core values of the principle of benefits of the Local Regulation No 6/2006 on Spatial Planning, which include: the principle of partnership, the principle of accountability, and the principle of transparency on the utilization of the regional areas of Makassar. A number of studies earlier have verified the theoretical proportions of Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith’s ACF on numerous policy areas in a number of countries. Research findings such as Bandelow & Kundolf (2011), Ainuson (2009), Fafard (2008), Suwiriti (2008), Meijerink (2005), Millar (2005), Chen (2001), and Kübler(2001), supported the theoretical proportion of the 1998 version of the Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith’s ACF. These research studies displayed that the ACF could be used in explaining changes in policy. On the other hand, studies such as Warner (2008), Avdellas (2005), Litfin (2000), and Sotirov & Memmler (2010) showed that the empirical support towards the ACF validity was relatively could not explain the policy changing phenomenon. The inconsistency of the empirical literature means that the public administration studies should increase the number of empirical studies on policy changing with different context of implementation.

This research was important to be conducted in order to analyze the changes on the spatial planning of Makassar, which was shifted from the original blueprint. The shifting was triggered by the competition between the advocacy coalitions who take part in influencing the subsystem of spatial policy in Makassar.

Based on the empirical phenomenon above, the researcher formulated the research questions as follow: (1) What is the form of policy changing in the spatial planning of Makassar? (2) What is the form of resources used by advocacy coalitions in influencing policy changing? (3) What is the form of the strategy of advocacy coalitions in influencing the spatial planning of Makassar? The purpose of this research was to analyze: (1) The form of policy changing in the context of spatial planning in Makassar, (2) The form of the sources that was used by advocacy coalitions in influencing policy changing, and (3) The form of strategy that was used by advocacy coalitions in influencing spatial planning policy in Makassar.
Policy changing was often considered to have two main characteristics, namely stability and changing (True, Jones, and Baumgartner, 2006). The element of stability was covering a number of public policy that more incremental, referring to the past, and policy changing was simply minor or marginal. Meanwhile, the element of changing refers to the fundamental changes of the content of the policy and the government programs changed dramatically.

Currently, the policy changing in various areas of public policy is more often seen than policy stability and continuity. The element of changing has become more apparent in the process of public policy than the element of stability (True, Jones, and Baumgartner, 2006). The study that the researcher conducted was a study on public policy changing.

The policy changing was defined as both major and minor changes on the subsystem of a policy or government program. The major changes refer to the changes in core aspects, whereas minor changes refer to the changes in secondary aspects of policies or government programs (Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 2007, 1999; 1993; Weible and Sabatier, 2007; Sabatier and Weible, 2006).

Based on these definitions, the concept of the policy changing refers to the hierarchical structure of the individual beliefs as policy participants. The terms “core aspects” and “secondary aspects” refer to the second and the third hierarchy in the structure of individual beliefs. The belief system was important because it determines the behavior. The individual beliefs of the policy participants determined whether the person tend to pursue mere material interests or conducting altruistic act (Sabatier, 2007; Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 2007, 1999; 1993; Weible and Sabatier, 2007; Sabatier and Weible, 2006).

ACF, as suggested by Sabatier and his colleagues, was the cutting-edge and widely adopted policy changing model. The ACF was designed to cover policy problems and decision situations that were marked with a high level of normative conflict and technical uncertainty, with a large number of actors among government. The ACF viewed policy changing from time to time mainly as the consequence of the competition between advocacy coalitions in a policy subsystem. The changes in advocacy coalitions occurred because of external changes that allow the power redistribution that resemble the belief system of a person on other people (Weible, Sabatier, and McQueen, 2009, Sabatier and Jenkins-Smith, 2007; Floraet al, 2007; Sabatier, 1991).

ACF assumed that actors would work hard to interpret the components of their belief system into actual policies before their counterparts did the same. On a certain period of time, each coalitions adopted a strategy by considering one or more institutional innovation that they considered to be supportive toward their policy goals (Sabatier and Weible, 2007).

ACF argued that advocacy coalitions provided the means that was very beneficial to aggregate the behavior of hundreds of organizations and individuals that were involved in a policy subsystem in one particular decade or more. In a particular policy subsystem, in general there would be two to three advocacy coalitions. (Sabatier and Weible, 2007).

In the theoretical perspective of ACF, the resources refers mainly to political resources (Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1999; Weible & Sabatier, 2007). The political resources is the resources that is used in political decision-making (Piven & Cloward, 2005). Political resources may cover: (1) Votes and other forms of political support; (2) Money, property and other materialis; (3) Information, knowledge, and skills; (4) Position, business contract, business license and profession, the permit to use government-owned land, and other means that facilitate advantageous decisions; (5) tax deduction; (6) Regulation or deregulation in a particular economy sector; (7) Economic security; (8) Reputation and position in the community; (9) The supports of principles and religious beliefs, morals, nationality, or ideology (Way, Jr, 2011).

In the concept of coalition strategy, each advocacy coalitions adopted one or more strategies to alter the behaviors on various government authorities and to realize their policy goals (Weible & Sabatier, 2007; Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1999, 1993). The most common advocacy strategy is the legal instrument alteration.

In their attempt to reach policy goals, the members of an advocacy coalition would mainly take actions in a similar rhythm, which was coordinating their activities and developing strategies from time to time so that the government institutions would act according to the policy belief of these actors. As an example: influencing the legislature to alter budget goals, altering the composition of political and administrative officials, influencing public opinion, reducing the target groups with rallies or boycott.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research used the qualitative approach with the consideration that this approach was often recommended for studies that seek to understand a complicated process (Imperial, 2001). The spatial policy subsystem is a complicated “real-world setting” that involve the actions from many actors with different interests that compete with each other, and taking place in a dynamic institutional context.

This research paper used to strategy of case study for empirical research purpose that investigate contemporary phenomenon in the real context, particularly when the limits between phenomenon and context were not clearly visible (Woodside, 2010). The case study is a typical strategy in qualitative research (Creswell, 2003).

The location of this research was on the Spatial Planning Development Region 1 and Development Region III in Makassar with the consideration that both development regions met the specification of the ACF concept from Sabatier-Jenkins-Smith, 2009.

This study replicated the empirical models in the past by combining several models. Such as the term “commercial” on major and minor coalitions
in the Makassar regional spatial planning policy that was adopted from Sotirov & Memmler (2010). The definitions of the resources of the advocacy coalition that was used to influence an outcome was referring to (Piven & Cloward, 2005), the definition of strategy that was used to alter the behavior of various government authorities and to realize policy goals was referring to (Weible & Sabatier, 2007; Sabatier & Jenkins-Smith, 1999, 1993). All of the previous empirical models that were used as references in this research paper used the qualitative approach so therefore this research model did not only cover variables that were deemed important but also used the models that have been tested.

This research model included the resources of advocacy coalition because resources allowed the strategy development to influence policies. Stakeholder would strategically utilize their stakeholders to influence policies in a variety of ways (Weible and Sabatier, 2007). This research paper used a common data collection method in qualitative research, which include (1) interviews with key informants; (2) study on literature and documents from programs/activities, and (3) observation.

The researcher used the Multi-Stakeholder Analysis (MSA) procedure to obtain and analyze valid and reliable data. In conducting the MSA procedure, the researcher made reference to the stakeholder analysis device from Deutsche Gesellschaft für Technische Zusammenarbeit (GTZ, 2007). GTZ offered seven building blocks to design coalition cooperation system and stakeholder characteristics. Characteristics and stakeholder identification procedure, according to GTZ procedure, were as followed:

Procedure 1 and 2 (the identification of key stakeholders and stakeholder mapping) were conducted through interviews with key informants who were familiar with the research topic. These interviews would subsequently be analyzed to gain comprehension on stakeholders and their mapping. The stakeholder mapping was important to visualize relevant stakeholders, the characteristics of their relations in coalitions, and their issues. Procedure 3 (profile and stakeholder strategic options) was conducted to identify both the differences and the similarities among stakeholders or stakeholder coalitions, and testing as well as discussing strategic options on spatial planning.

Procedure 4 (power and resources) was conducted to visualize the power differences and the influence among stakeholders, monitoring how the changes of objective impacts from the power and resources in power relations to understand stakeholder structure. Procedure 5 (interests and scope of action) was conducted to outline the interests of the stakeholders in the context of spatial issues as well as the changes, as well as identifying the constraints of behavioral and scope of action of the stakeholders. Procedure 6 (influence and involvement of stakeholder) was conducted to assess the influence of the stakeholder toward behavior on the direction of changes and the progress in policy implementation, as well as analyzing and developing tentative comprehension on involvement strategy. Procedure 7 was conducted to identify the behavioral patterns of certain stakeholders in relation to policy changing, and discussing strategic options to reduce resistance.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

According to the results of the research, it was found that the spatial planning policy in Makassar experienced alterations from the governmental decree on the policy that was introduced before hand, such as on the case of beach reclamation permit in the national space of Losari Beach in Makassar. The episode was a subject of complaint from many groups in addition to the provision of beach border line. The Makassar City Government issued the permit to develop buildings on the beach reclamation area in accordance with the Makassar Local Regulation No. 15/2004 on Building Planning. On the other hand, the area was a subject to a higher regulation, which was the Presidential Regulation No. 55, Article 101, year 2011 on Makassar, Maros, Sungguminasa, dan Takalar (Mamminasata) Spatial Planning. The area was also located in the L2 Zone or beach border line, which was meant to certain activities such as beach recreation, coastal security, fishing activities, port activities, landing point for underwater cables and/or pipes and water quality control activities, which means that hotel development was not included.

Another policy that was different from the original blueprint of spatial planning was the Karebosi Square Revitalization Project in 2007. The Makassar Government made a deal with one of the companies in Makassar to revitalize the square with Build-Operate-Transfer (BOT) contract for as many as 1,200 stalls in 30-year period contract.

From the beginning, the decision from the Makassar City Government to revitalize the Karebosi Square triggered protests from various civil society elements. A number of university students and some legislators rejected the Karebosi Square Revitalization Project. An informant for this research mentioned that various civil society elements would give their endorsements if the meaning of revitalization was to arrange or to decorate the place without altering its function as public space (interview with Mj, November 19, 2013).

In the beginning of the execution of the Karebosi Square Revitalization Project construction, the government faced challenges from a variety of civil society elements, to the point that some of them took legal actions. In addition, the revitalization project at the time did not receive both HPL and HGB permits from the South Sulawesi Chapter of National Land Agency (BPN), yet the Makassar City Government still went on with the project. Moreover, the Makassar City Government allocated their budget and providing permits for around 3,000 sellers to conduct business activities in the underground area of Karebosi.

The policy changing of the Makassar City Government in the context of spatial planning that was previously fixed trigger targeted and non-targeted impacts. The targeted impacts were on the parameter of problems on the spatial planning in Makassar, which are both positive and negative. The targeted positive impacts included economic and regional income
growth that would lead to community welfare, whereas the non-targeted negative impacts included the lack of obedience from the government and the businesses toward law and regulations. In addition, there was a conflict between the governmental structure as well as environmental impact that lead to floods on several residential areas.

The results of this research paper indicated that there were two advocacy coalitions in the regional spatial planning in Makassar, namely: (1) The “commercial” type major coalition, and (2) The “pro-social” type minor coalition. The terms for these advocacy coalitions were adapted from several empirical literature in the past that used the ACF framework that was used by Sotirov and Memmler (2010) that was also deemed to have similarities with the term “pro-commodity” coalition (Salka, 2004), “pro-development” coalition (Lerzman 1996, Cashore & Howlett, 2007), and “production” coalition (Hysing & Osson, 2008).

These actors who populate the commercial type major advocacy coalition in the regional spatial planning policy in Makassar were separated into five advocacy coalition actors, namely: (1) The Major and relevant Regional Working Unit (SKPD); (2) Both central and regional politicians; (3) University academicians; (4) Business actors; and (5) community leaders. These actors were part of the major coalition, particularly the actor from the relevant SKPD who have different functions and jobs according to the type of issued licenses.

The major advocacy coalition in this research was referred as commercial type because this coalition was very oriented to the economic development/growth, and prefer radical policies (Sotirov & Memmler, 2010). This could be observed on the commercial-type actors in Makassar as illustrated from the way these major coalition actors in defining the blueprint on each regional planning, especially in providing infrastructure support of commerce and residences in order to achieve the main goals of the area in an optimal fashion. The example of the core beliefs policy of the pro-commercial actors could be seen on the design of the Karebosi Square which, in addition to green open space and sports arena, also including business center. A similar example could be seen on the location of Losari Beach, which in addition to serve as a developed public space, also served as business center.

The actors within the major coalition viewed the entire public space in Makassar as the commodity of which the value could be maximized in encouraging infrastructure and regional economic growth. Moreover, these actors saw that the achievement of main goals from certain regions would be very determined with the availability of economic infrastructure in the region. As an example, the achievement of the main goal of an integrated higher education area in Tamalanrea was deemed to be very determined by the availability of trade and industry facility.

The resources that was used by the major coalition in Makassar was different based on the stages of process and the moment of its struggle. These resources include: (1) Votes and other forms of political support; (2) Money; (3) Information, knowledge, and skills; (4) Position. The order of these resources was not reflecting each of their relative interests because each resources was deemed to have advantages and used on different moments.

The resources of votes and other forms of political support was used mainly in the process of licencing for the development/revitalization of the Karebosi Square. The design of the Karebosi Square Revitalization Project, according to the major coalition, would provide at least 3,000 employments, including employees and businesses who utilize the underground area of Karebosi Square.

Another important resources that was used by the major coalition to fight for the spatial planning policy in Makassar was money. The utilization of money resources was apparent in every policy cases that the researcher found. However, there was dissimilarity in terms of the utilization of money resources in the stage of policy making and in the stage of policy implementation.

In the stage of policy decision-making, the money resources was more referred to the potential resources that was shaped in terms such as investment target and local government income. The programs and the activities of the regional spatial planning, according to an argument from the major coalition, would significantly increase the investment and the local government income.

The information, knowledge, and skills resources were the main tools in the stage of policy-making process. The major coalition used the information, knowledge, and skills resources mainly to pass their proposals of policies and programs. The group of experts and consultants from universities, as well as environment activists through the world environment forum, provided the support of information, knowledge, and skills to influence the opinions and the attitudes of the public toward the existence of spatial planning policy in the cases of Karebosi Square, Losari Beach, and integrated higher education area in Tamalanrea.

The resources of positions were mainly utilized in the stage of policy implementation. The utilization target would be the top officials of the SKPD, especially SKPD Head. The top officials were seen here as the actors who would speed up the implementation process of the decisions/policies taken by the Major. The major coalition in the regional spatial planning policy in Makassar would utilize several types of political resources as identified by Piven & Cloward (2005). However, several types of resources stood out more in the stage of policy making or decision making, whereas other types of resources were predominantly used in the implementation stage of the decision. However, there was a type of resources that were used sustainably on each policy stages.

The competition in the context of spatial policy changing in Makassar between each coalitions, namely major advocacy coalition and minor advocacy coalition, adopted more than one strategies to alter the behavior
from various government authorities and to realize their policy goals. The most commonly used advocacy strategy was the alteration of legal instruments, cooperation, persuasion and education, pilot programs, litigation, and confrontation. The major coalition in the regional spatial planning policy in Makassar, in a bid to realize their policy goals, would use a combination of several strategies, namely: (1) the alteration of legal instruments, (2) information, (3) cooperative, and (4) persuasion and education. However the combination of these strategies would be different from one decision to another.

Altering legal instruments was the most dominant strategy in the ACF literature. The major coalition would use this strategy as the main strategy in influencing the behavior of government authorities. The major coalition in the regional spatial planning policy in Makassar also utilized the strategy. The alteration of legal instruments in order to realize the policy goals of the major coalition was apparent from the changing of the regional vision of Makassar, followed by the changing of SKPD vision, including the Spatial and Building Planning department, the Trade Agency vision, and the Trade and Investment Agency vision.

The second strategy from the major coalition was non-transparent information. The major coalition in the regional spatial planning policy subsystem of Makassar provided non-transparent information on the fulfillment of licensing requirements as well as budget information. For example, the procedure for the drafting of recommendations at relevant technical institutions, disturbance permits, and environmental impact analysis (Amdal), which in fact was the requirements for IMB permits, was never explained publicly. The information that was published by the government was merely on the projection of investment growth and local government income.

The cooperation strategy as the third strategy was also utilized by the major coalition to consolidate the top officials of SKPD. The top officials whose attitude deemed to be not in line with the regional vision could be not included in certain activities.

The persuasion and education strategy as the fourth strategy was another story, as it was used by the major coalition in responding criticism and answering the questions from other parties in relation to the regional spatial planning policy of Makassar. For instance, the top officials of the relevant SKPD and the politicians of the Makassar Legislative Council (DPRD) would try persuading the parties who challenged the projects that were not in accordance with the specification by explaining that the requirements and procedures for the permits were already met, and these projects would support the Makassar economic growth.

The actors in the minor advocacy coalition in the regional spatial planning policy of Makassar were “pro-social” type. The term “pro-social” was adopted by the researcher from several empirical literature in the past that used the ACF framework. The term “pro-social” in the advocacy coalition type was used by Sotirov & Memmler (2010).

The actors in the “pro-social” minor coalition advocacy in the regional spatial planning policy in Makassar were classified into three advocacy coalition actors, namely: (1) The Governor and the South Sulawesi Province Government officials, (2) Local politicians, and (3) Civil society organizations.

The minor coalition used three types of resources in the regional spatial planning policy of Makassar both in terms of advocacy and to improve their power position. The resources here include votes, position, and moral beliefs. The order of these resources did not reflect its relative interests since all resources were used for different purposes. The minor coalition would use the resources of votes or other forms of political supports in the stage of decision making and the decision implementation. In the decision making stage, this type of resources was used by the factions of the Makassar DPRD to reject the local government plan on the Karebosi Square Revitalization Project. Some online sources stated that several factions did not sign meeting results, even under the pressure of group of university students. Also, the politicians opposed the local government on the implementation of development that was not in line with the designation, but the researcher could not confirm this statement because these actors were not available for interviews.

The utilization of political sources of minor coalition was integrated with the resources of moral beliefs. The politicians who joined the minor coalition gained the moral support from civil society groups. The civil society groups who gave their moral support including traditional institutions, the Legal Aid Foundation (LBH), and groups of university students. Even some of the civil society groups carried their movement separately, the more prominent movement was visible when they joined the common forum. The minor coalition used the resources of positions to advocate their beliefs in the Karebosi Square Revitalization Project. In this case, the Regional Office of the South Sulawesi Chapter of BPN was yet to issue the permits/certificates of HPL and HBG. In the beginning stage of the execution of the project, the reason behind the decision to not issue HPL and HGB permits was the absence of rights over land, which was the Karebosi Square was not determined as the assets of the Makassar City Government.

The first strategy was to control the procedure. According to the politicians of the DPRD and NGO activists, the strategy to control the licensing procedure on a variety of projects that were executed by the Makassar City Government such as conducting rallies to stop the Karebosi Square Revitalization Project, urging the discontinuation of beach reclamation, hotel construction, and Mall Plaza Tamalanrea construction. The control over the procedure was not applied well by the major coalition in the cases of beach reclamation and hotel construction on Losari Beach area. According to online information in mass media, the Makassar City Government issued the building permits, but the license holder, in addition to construct building, also did beach
hoarding that exceeding the provisions of beach border line. The researcher could not confirm the statement because the hotel management was unavailable for interviews. However, at least, this gave us an illustration on how the Makassar City Government did not properly supervise the implementation of its own decisions.

In the practice of procedure-controlling strategy as mentioned above, the minor coalition coordinated with the Local Police Department, oceanographers and environmental experts from universities. This strategy was successful because the construction work of beach reclamation and hotel development could be stopped temporarily and subsequently entered legal process. Meanwhile, in response to the process, the major coalition said that the developer exceeded the permits that were given to them.

The confrontation strategy was used by the minor coalition to challenge the implementation of the Karebosi Square Revitalization Project and the Mall Plaza Tamalanrea Project. This strategy included the form of rallies from various elements of the civil society and sealing threats from authorized province officials. The utilization of the strategy on the Karebosi Square Revitalization Project was based on the perception from the community leaders that revitalization was similar to selling and commercializing public land. The major coalition on the regional spatial planning policy subsystem, whereas the minor coalition on the regional spatial planning policy in Makassar was more political sources in influencing the changes on the strategic form that was taken by the minor coalition in the regional spatial planning policy in Makassar was controlling the procedure and confrontation.
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**CONCLUSION**

According to results and discussion of this research paper, we could conclude that the form of changes of the original blueprint of the spatial planning of Makassar was more in the policy domain and not in the institutional regulation domain. The commercial type major coalition in Makassar adopted the decisions on spatial planning that were different from the original blueprint on regional spatial planning policy as specified on the Makassar Local Regulation No 6/2006 on the Makassar City Spatial Planning 2005-2015. The different spatial planning decision was apparent on the licensing permits on beach reclamation and hotel construction as well as housing and local protection area.

The form of resources that was used by the minor coalition in the regional spatial planning policy in Makassar were relatively limited. The limited utilization of resources by the minor coalition could be effective in certain cases but relatively less or even not effective in other cases.
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