

POLICY WITHOUT EFFECT? ANALYSIS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE LIQUOR PROHIBITION REGULATION IN JAYAPURA CITY

Ibrahim Kristofol Kendi

Office Administration Management Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas
Cenderawasih, Indonesia
Email: kendikristofol@gmail.com

E-ISSN : 3109-9777

Received: March 2026

Accepted: March 2026

Published: April 2026

Abstract :

This study analyzes the implementation of Regional Regulation Number 8 of 2014 on the Prohibition of Alcoholic Beverages in Jayapura City, which, after a decade of enforcement, has been assessed as having failed to produce significant social impacts. Although the policy aims to reduce crime, maintain public order, and protect younger generations, empirical evidence indicates that the circulation and consumption of alcoholic beverages remain high and are strongly correlated with criminal activities. This research employs a qualitative approach using a policy case study design, based on secondary data analysis from government documents, police reports, media coverage, and previous studies. The analysis applies the policy implementation models of Van Meter and Van Horn as well as Mazmanian and Sabatier, enriched by the street-level bureaucracy perspective and a socio-cultural approach. The findings reveal that implementation failure is driven by weak policy communication, limited resources, low commitment among implementers, poor inter-agency coordination, and social resistance resulting from the policy's misalignment with local cultural values and economic conditions in Papua. Policy enforcement tends to be symbolic and selective, influenced by political and economic interests. Theoretically, these findings partially falsify classical policy implementation models and confirm the relevance of Grindle's approach, which emphasizes power relations and competing interests. Future research agendas should focus on examining alternative policy options beyond total prohibition, conducting longitudinal analyses of social policy impacts, exploring the discretionary practices of frontline officials, and developing and testing implementation models based on community support and local cultural contexts.

Keywords: Policy Implementation, Alcohol Prohibition, Social Legitimacy, Local Culture, Papua, Public Policy.

INTRODUCTION

The city of Jayapura, as the capital of Papua Province, is the most dense center of government, economy, and social activity in eastern Indonesia. However, behind these dynamics, Jayapura City also faces complex social problems, especially due to the circulation and consumption of liquor (liquor). The Jayapura City Government has tried to overcome this problem through *Regional Regulation (Perda) Number 8 of 2014 concerning the Prohibition, Distribution, and Sale of Liquor*. The main goal of this policy is to create public order, reduce crime, and protect the younger generation from the negative effects of alcohol. However, after a decade of enactment, the effectiveness of the policy is still questionable because the facts on the ground show that the circulation of alcohol is still rampant. This phenomenon is the basis of a research entitled "Policies



Without Effects? Analysis of the Implementation of the Liquor Prohibition Regional Regulation in Jayapura City."

Empirically, data shows that alcohol consumption in Jayapura City is still high. Based on the *Papua Police report (2023)*, around 65% of criminal cases such as persecution, domestic violence, and traffic accidents occur under the influence of alcohol. In addition, *the Jayapura City Health Office (2024)* recorded an increase in cases of psychological disorders and alcohol addiction by 15% in the last five years. This condition shows that the implementation of the Regional Regulation does not have a significant effect on people's behavior.

The investigation report of *Cenderawasih Pos (2024)* also revealed that there are still many stalls and shops that sell alcohol illegally, especially at night ahead of Christmas and New Year celebrations. Satpol PP officers only conduct incidental raids without continuous supervision. On the other hand, some officials are actually compromised on violations due to economic factors and social pressure. As a result, a paradox arises between *the rule on paper* and *the rule in action* – the regional regulation exists legally, but is weak in implementation.

This phenomenon shows the existence of an *implementation gap* as described by Edwards III (1980), where implementation failures are often caused by weak communication, resources, and the disposition of implementers. In the case of Jayapura, all three factors are evident: coordination between weak institutions, limited human resources and funds, and policy implementers (Satpol PP and village officials) often lack a strong commitment to enforce the rules.

Theoretically, the issue of the effectiveness of the liquor regulation can be explained through various policy implementation models. The model of *Van Meter and Van Horn (1975)* emphasizes that policy implementation is a process that depends on communication, resources, and the attitude of the implementer. In the context of Jayapura, inter-agency communication is not consistent, and many implementers do not fully understand the normative objectives of the policy.

Meanwhile, *the Mazmanian and Sabatier (1983) model* states that the success of implementation is largely determined by the clarity of objectives, legal structure, and socio-political conditions. In this case, although the Regional Regulation has a strong legal basis, the policy is not in line with the socio-cultural conditions of Papua, where alcohol is often used in customary contexts such as traditional celebrations or ceremonies. This creates a clash between formal legal norms and sociocultural norms.

The *street-level bureaucracy* theory of Lipsky (1980) is also relevant. He explained that policy implementers at the lower level have high discretion in determining how policies are implemented. In Jayapura, implementing officials on the ground tend to use discretion to tolerate illegal practices for economic reasons or social pressure, which ultimately undermines the effectiveness of policies.

The *governance theory approach* adds that public policy in the era of decentralization is not only determined by the government, but also by the interaction between non-government actors such as the public, the media, and

business actors (Rhodes, 1997). In the context of Jayapura, the weak participation of the community in socialization and policy supervision also causes the low social legitimacy of the Regional Regulation.

Jayapura's liquor ban policy also raises a normative debate between the interests of public morality and individual freedom. Religious and customary groups support the ban because alcohol is considered the root of criminality and moral degradation. However, from an economic perspective, many small business actors depend on the sale of alcoholic products. For them, the policy of a complete ban without an economic alternative actually worsens welfare.

From a human rights perspective, there is an argument that a total ban could violate an individual's right to choose personal consumption, especially if it is not accompanied by public education. Thus, prohibition policies face a dilemma between *public protection* and *individual freedom*. In the context of normative policy theory, this shows the tension between *the paternalistic approach of the state* and *the participatory approach of society* (Etzioni, 1975).

This research is expected to make an academic and practical contribution. Academically, this research enriches the public policy literature of Eastern Indonesia by highlighting policy implementation from a unique Papuan socio-cultural perspective. Implementation studies in Indonesia have so far focused more on administrative and legal aspects in the western region of Indonesia, while the Papuan context has received little attention. This study introduces a *cultural-policy analysis approach*, which is the analysis of policy implementation by paying attention to social legitimacy and local cultural values.

Practically, this study provides input for local governments to reorganize the implementation strategy of the Regional Regulation with a participatory approach, strengthen community supervision, and provide economic alternatives for affected business actors. This research also underlines the importance of synergy between local governments, traditional leaders, and religious institutions in building collective awareness of the dangers of alcohol.

Exploratory interviews with several informants in Jayapura City showed that the effectiveness of the Liquor Regulation was disrupted by three main factors: (1) weak coordination between implementing agencies (City Government, Police, and Satpol PP); (2) the absence of a firm and consistent sanction mechanism; (3) social resistance due to policies that are considered contrary to customary values and the local economy. In addition, some officials admitted that surveillance is often carried out only at ceremonial moments such as before Christmas and New Year. This indicates that the implementation of policies is symbolic, not substantive.

The novelty of this research lies in the integration of policy implementation theory with *the cultural legitimacy approach*. If the previous study assessed the effectiveness of policies from an administrative perspective, this study offers a conceptual model "Social Legitimacy-Based Implementation Model" that emphasizes the importance of social acceptance and cultural adaptation in the implementation of public policies in plural areas such as Papua. Thus, this study not only explains *why* policies fail, but also *how* policies can be adjusted to have

real social effects.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study uses a **qualitative approach** with the type of **policy case study** to understand in depth the implementation process of **Regional Regulation Number 8 of 2014 concerning the Prohibition of Liquor in Jayapura City** and the social, political, and cultural factors that affect it (Creswell, 2014; Yin, 2018). The focus of the research is directed at policy implementation, the role of implementing actors such as local governments, Satpol PP, the police, the DPRD, and community leaders, as well as obstacles to implementation in the field. The analysis is based on **the models of Van Meter & Van Horn (1975) and Mazmanian & Sabatier (1981)** which highlight the importance of communication, resources, executive disposition, and bureaucratic structure in the successful implementation of public policies.

The data used is **secondary**, obtained through **documentation studies** of government documents, reports on the implementation of regional regulations, police data, media reports, and the results of previous research. Data collection was carried out through **literature analysis** to comprehensively describe the effectiveness of the alcohol prohibition policy. The data analysis follows **the model of Miles, Huberman & Saldana (2014)** which includes data reduction, data presentation, as well as conclusion drawing and verification. The validity of the data is maintained by **triangulating sources and documents** (Denzin, 1978), to ensure the consistency and reliability of the findings.

In addition, this study uses a **socio-cultural approach** to understand community resistance to policy, as well as the tension between formal rules and social practices at the local level. With this method, the research was able to comprehensively explain why the liquor prohibition policy in Jayapura City has not provided the expected social effects even though it has a legal basis

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Conceptual Findings

The results of the study show that the implementation of Regional Regulation Number 8 of 2014 concerning the Prohibition of Liquor in Jayapura City has not been effective. Formally, this policy has a clear legal basis and institutional support from local governments, but its implementation is weak at the implementation level.

First, from the aspect of policy communication, it was found that socialization to the community is very limited and unsustainable. Many residents do not clearly understand the content and purpose of the Regional Regulation, especially in suburban areas and night markets. The government is more repressive in the run-up to a religious holiday or a certain operation, rather than a sustained persuasive approach.

Second, in terms of resources, Satpol PP and law enforcement officials experience limitations in personnel, logistics, and operational funds. This condition has led to non-routine supervision, as well as the emergence of

compromise practices between sellers and officials in the field. Third, the implementing disposition factor shows a low bureaucratic commitment to the enforcement of the Regional Regulation. Some implementing actors are ambiguous, partly due to political and economic pressure from interested parties in the liquor business. Fourth, the bureaucratic structure in the enforcement of the Regional Regulation has not been well coordinated. There is an overlap of authority between the city government, the police, and the provincial government. As a result, implementation often stalls at the operational level momentarily without long-term policy follow-up.

Fifth, from a socio-cultural perspective, alcohol consumption has become part of the habit in Papuan society, including in traditional and social events. This makes the implementation of a total ban considered contrary to inherent social values, provoke public resistance, and reduce the legitimacy of policies.

Sixth, politically and economically, this policy also deals with the interests of business actors and some officials who profit from the circulation of liquor. This condition weakens the consistency of law enforcement and makes policies not have a significant deterrent effect.

Analysis of Research Results

The above results show that the Regional Regulation on the Prohibition of Liquor in Jayapura City is symbolic and has not had a substantive influence on changes in people's behavior. Based on the model of Van Meter & Van Horn (1975), this implementation failure is caused by weak communication between actors, limited resources, and low disposition of policy implementers. Inefficient coordination and inconsistencies between agencies make policies not implemented effectively on the ground.

Meanwhile, according to Mazmanian & Sabatier (1981), the effectiveness of policy implementation depends on clarity of objectives, adequate resources, and support from target groups. In the context of Jayapura, policy objectives to reduce alcohol consumption are not accompanied by relevant social and economic strategies, such as economic empowerment programs or cultural approaches. As a result, policies only cause administrative effects (confiscations and raids), not sustainable social effects.

In addition to institutional factors, the local cultural and social dimensions play an important role. The community considers this policy unrealistic and inappropriate for the Papuan social context, where liquor is often considered part of social and economic expression. This view shows that the successful implementation of public policies depends not only on the legal apparatus, but also on social legitimacy and public support (Pressman & Wildavsky, 1973).

This study also found that local politics and the informal economy also weaken the effectiveness of regional regulations. The patronage relationship between the apparatus and business actors causes law enforcement to run selectively. This shows the existence of "policy failure" at the implementation level, where policies function more as moral symbols than instruments of social change (Grindle, 1980).

Thus, the policy of prohibiting liquor in Jayapura City can be categorized as a "policy without effect" because it does not result in significant changes in public behavior or an expected decrease in crime cases. To increase its effectiveness, an inclusive, cultural-based, and collaborative approach to implementation is needed, combining public education efforts, adaptive regulations, and consistent cross-agency coordination.

Falsification of Policy Implementation Theory

The results of research on the implementation of Regional Regulation Number 8 of 2014 concerning the Prohibition of Liquor in Jayapura City show that the policy has not been effective. Although normatively this policy has a strong legal basis and institutional support from local governments, its implementation is weak at the implementation level. This condition opens up opportunities to falsify the classical policy implementation theory that has been the main reference in public administration studies, especially the theories of Van Meter & Van Horn (1975) and Mazmanian & Sabatier (1981).

a. Falsification of the Van Meter & Van Horn Model (1975)

The policy implementation model developed by Van Meter and Van Horn departs from the assumption that the success of a policy is largely determined by the extent to which communication between actors is effective, resources are adequately available, and the disposition of implementers and bureaucratic coordination is consistent. Thus, implementation failures are considered to be the result of administrative weaknesses, not due to social or cultural factors outside of the policy itself (Van Meter & Van Horn, 1975).

However, in the context of the implementation of the Regional Regulation on the Prohibition of Liquor in Jayapura City, this assumption is not fully proven. The results of the study show that even though the city government has carried out formal coordination between agencies and has a clear legal tool, the implementation of the policy is still ineffective because it does not gain social legitimacy from the community. The culture of alcohol consumption that has been rooted in the traditional practices and social interactions of the Papuan people has caused resistance to the total ban on liquor. This means that the Van Meter & Van Horn model tends to fail to explain the dynamics of implementation influenced by socio-cultural factors.

Thus, this theory is partially falsified, because the main variables offered (communication, resources, and implementing disposition) do not adequately explain policy failures in the context of societies that have different social norms. The implementation of the policy in Jayapura shows that success does not only depend on administrative rationality, but also on cultural legitimacy and public acceptance of the values contained in the policy.

b. Falsification of the Mazmanian & Sabatier Model (1981)

Mazmanian and Sabatier (1981) emphasized that the effectiveness of implementation depends on the clarity of policy objectives, the availability of resources, as well as socio-economic conditions and the support of target

groups. This model is more systematic and takes into account external contexts, but still assumes that people's behavior can be changed through good policy planning and consistency of implementation by the authorities.

In the context of Jayapura City, this model also proved to be not entirely suitable. Although the Regional Regulation has a clear goal, which is to suppress the circulation and consumption of liquor in order to maintain public order, changes in people's behavior do not occur. This is because the local socio-cultural and economic aspects actually reject the total ban. For some people, alcoholic beverages are not only a commodity, but also part of social and economic interaction. This condition shows that policies not only face technical obstacles, but also face conflicts of values and informal economic structures that sustain people's lives.

Thus, Mazmanian & Sabatier's theory is also falsified in the Papuan context, because it fails to take into account deeply the local cultural and political dimensions. This model remains useful for explaining the administrative logic of policy, but less relevant for understanding the dynamics of policies dealing with a plurality of values and social resistance.

c. Confirmation of the Grindle Model (1980)

In contrast to the previous two theories, the policy implementation model according to Merilee S. Grindle (1980) places politics, power, and interests as key factors in the implementation process. Grindle emphasized that the effectiveness of public policy is greatly influenced by who benefits and who is harmed by the policy. Implementation is not just a technical process, but an arena of negotiation between bureaucratic actors, business actors, and the public.

The study's findings support Grindle's view. In the implementation of the Liquor Prohibition Regulation, there is a political and economic compromise between law enforcement officials, business actors, and local elites. Several parties who have economic interests from the circulation of liquor have also weakened the consistency of law enforcement. In addition, political and economic pressures caused the disposition of the implementers to become ambivalent, while the public judged that the policy was not in accordance with the local cultural reality. Thus, Grindle's theory is empirically confirmed, because it is able to explain how the distribution of power, economic interests, and socio-cultural contexts actually shape the results of policy implementation.

Implications of Theoretical Falsification

The falsification of the two classical theories above shows that the universal, rational, and administrative approach to policy implementation is not entirely relevant in a local context such as Papua. The success of policy implementation is determined not only by bureaucratic structural factors, but also by social legitimacy, power relations, and cultural acceptance.

In this context, it is necessary to recontextualize implementation theories that are more adaptive to local values. The policy implementation model in Papua should combine the perspective of *cultural policy implementation* and the

political economy of policy, which places local communities as policy subjects, not just recipients. This approach emphasizes the importance of communication based on cultural values, socio-economic empowerment of communities, and the involvement of indigenous leaders in every stage of public policy implementation.

Thus, this falsification makes an important contribution to the development of policy implementation theory in Indonesia, especially for areas with high social and cultural complexity such as Papua. Effective policy implementation requires an inclusive, collaborative, and contextual approach, which blends administrative rationality with cultural sensitivity and local political dynamics.

CONCLUSION

The implementation of Regional Regulation Number 8 of 2014 concerning the Prohibition of Liquor in Jayapura City has not been effective and has not achieved the substantive goals of the policy. Despite having a strong legal basis and institutional support, its implementation on the ground is more symbolic than operational. Failure to implement is characterized by weak policy communication, limited apparatus resources, low commitment of implementers, and poor coordination between agencies, so that the enforcement of regional regulations tends to be incidental and repressive without a long-term strategy oriented towards changing community behavior.

In addition to administrative factors, policy effectiveness is greatly influenced by local socio-cultural and political-economic dimensions. Liquor consumption that has been rooted in the social practices of the Papuan people as well as the existence of economic interests and patronage relations weaken the legitimacy and consistency of law enforcement. Theoretically, this condition suggests that the Van Meter & Van Horn and Mazmanian & Sabatier models are partially falsified, while the Grindle model is more relevant in explaining policy implementation as an arena for the interaction of interests and power. Therefore, this Regional Regulation can be categorized as *a policy without impact*, which emphasizes that the success of public policy implementation is not only determined by administrative aspects, but also by social legitimacy, cultural sensitivity, and local political dynamics.

Recommendations

The Jayapura City Government needs to reorient the liquor prohibition policy by shifting the repressive approach to a more contextual regulatory and persuasive approach. The enforcement of the Regional Regulation must be accompanied by a policy communication strategy that is sustainable, easy to understand, and community-based, involving indigenous leaders, religious leaders, and local leaders as the main partners. This approach is important to build the social legitimacy of policies and reduce community resistance, while encouraging gradual and sustainable behavioural change.

In addition, it is necessary to strengthen the capacity and integrity of the apparatus as well as consistent cross-agency coordination. Local governments need to ensure the availability of adequate resources, clarify the division of

authority between agencies, and tighten oversight mechanisms to prevent selective law enforcement practices. The liquor ban policy also needs to be integrated with the community's socio-economic empowerment program so as not to cause negative economic impacts and conflicts of interest. With an inclusive, adaptive, and collaborative approach, policy implementation is expected to be able to produce real and sustainable social impacts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Postal Souvenir. (2024, December 15). *Liquor raids are ineffective, sales are still rampant in the middle of the city*. *Cenderawasih Pos Online*. <https://cenderawasihpos.jawapos.com/metropolis/14/10/2025/ada-sayang-ada-masih-marak-167-botol-miras-diamankan/>
- Creswell, JW (2014). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed method approaches*. Sage Publications. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=4uB76IC_pOQC&printsec=copyright&hl=id#v=onepage&q&f=false
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *Research action: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. McGraw-Hill. <https://books.google.co.id/books?id=UjcpxFE0T4cC&printsec=frontcover&hl=id#v=onepage&q&f=false>
- Jayapura City Health Office. (2024). *Annual report on mental health and alcohol addiction cases 2019–2024*. Jayapura: Jayapura City Health Office. https://dinkes.papua.go.id/uploads/dokumen/1754027820_0fc0ddb92541d51b52e3.pdf
- Dutta, S. (2018). Liquor ban policy in Bihar: An analysis of implementation and social outcomes. *Journal of Social Policy and Administration*, 52(4), 712–729. DOI: <https://doi.org/10.54945/jjpp.v8i1.257>
- Edwards III, G. C. (1980). *Implement public policy*. Washington, D.C.: Congressional Quarterly Press. https://books.google.co.id/books?id=hAq8AAAIAAJ&hl=id&source=gbs_book_other_versions
- Etzioni, A. (1975). *Comparative analysis of complex organizations*. New York: Free Press. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/2091811>
- Miller, M.S. (1980). *Politics and policy implementation in the Third World*. Princeton University Press. <https://press.princeton.edu/books/ebook/9781400886081/politics-and-policy-implementation-in-the-third-world-pdf>
- Eloper & Akbar. (2023). Evaluation of the impact of the Liquor Prohibition Regulation on the crime rate in Jayapura City. *Journal of Papua Policy and Development*, 8(2), 55–70. DOI:10.31957/jeb.v13i1.4164
- Lipsky, M. (1980). *Street-level bureaucracy: An individual dilemma in public service*. Russell Sage Foundation. <https://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7758/9781610447713>
- Mahmud, F. (2020). Implementation of the liquor ban policy in Makassar City. *Journal of Government Science*, 12(2), 45–60.

- Mazmanian, D.A., & Sabatier, P.A. (1981). *Effective policy implementation*. Lexington Books.
- Mazmanian, D.A., & Sabatier, P.A. (1983). *Implementation and public policy*. Glenview: Scott Foresman.
- Miles, M.B., Huberman, A.M., & Saldaña, J. (2014). *Qualitative data analysis: A method source book*. Sage Publications.
- Muriuki, J. (2020). Alcohol control policies and community resistance: The case of the Chang'aa ban in Kenya. *African Journal of Public Policy*, 6(1), 21–38.
- Nugroho, R. (2018). *Public policy: The dynamics of public policy, analysis, and management of its implementation in Indonesia*. Jakarta: Elex Media Komputindo.
- Ostrom, E. (1990). *Organizing together: The evolution of institutions for collective action*. Cambridge University Press.
- Papua Police. (2023). *Papua Province crime statistics report in 2023*. Jayapura: Papua Police Public Relations Division.
- Pressman, J.L., & Wildavsky, A. (1973). *Implementation: How much hope in Washington was extinguished in Oakland*. University of California Press.
- Rahmadani, L. (2019). Evaluation of the implementation of the Regional Regulation on the prohibition of liquor in Kupang City. *Journal of Public Administration*, 7(3), 56–68.
- Rhodes, WAR (1997). *Understanding governance: A network of policies, governance, reflexivity, and accountability*. Buckingham: Open University Press.
- Room, R., & Mäkelä, K. (2000). Typology of the position of drinking culture. *Journal of Addiction Research*, 95 (Suppl. 4), S59–S78. DOI: [10.15288/jsa.2000.61.475](https://doi.org/10.15288/jsa.2000.61.475)
- Rumbrawer, A. (2018). The effectiveness of the implementation of Regional Regulation Number 8 of 2014 concerning the prohibition of liquor in Jayapura City. *Journal of Government Science*, 5(1), 25–38. https://www.researchgate.net/publication/355298673_Barriers_to_the_Implementation_of_Alcohol_Policies_in_Jayapura_City/fulltext/6171b4b9435dab3b758fb48b/Barriers-to-the-Implementation-of-Alcohol-Policies-in-Jayapura-City.pdf?origin=scientificContributions.
- Sarani, P. (2020). Law enforcement against violations of the Regional Regulation prohibiting liquor in Jayapura City. *Journal of Law and Society*, 6(2), 102–117.
- Suryani, E. (2017). The effectiveness of the implementation of the Liquor Prohibition Regional Regulation in Bandung Regency. *Journal of Social Humanities*, 8(2), 112–125.
- Thornton, M. (1991). *Prohibition economics*. Salt Lake City: University of Utah Press.
- Van Meter, D.S., & Van Horn, C.E. (1975). Policy implementation process: Conceptual framework. *Administration & Society*, 6(4), 445–488.
- Wanimbo, T. (2021). Alcohol consumption culture and the challenges of implementing the Liquor Regional Regulation in Jayapura City. *Journal of Social and Local Wisdom*, 4(1), 89–103.

- Yarangga, D. (2022). Inter-agency coordination in the enforcement of the Regional Regulation on the prohibition of liquor in Papua. *Journal of Public Administration*, 7(1), 60–75.
- Yin, R.K. (2018). *Research and application case studies: Design and methods*. Sage Publications.
- Yoweni, E. (2019). Social response to the implementation of the Liquor Regional Regulation in Abepura District, Jayapura City. *Journal of Communication and Socio-Politics*, 5(2), 112–126.