

SPORTS POLICY IN INDONESIA: THE URGENCY OF PREPARING AND DEVELOPING AN OUTLINE OF THE NATIONAL SPORTS MASTER PLAN

Ellectrananda Anugerah Ash-shidiqqi¹, Doris Rahmat², Syahid Akhmad Faisol³,
Indra Devian Lumban Gaol⁴.

Faculty of Law Universitas Negeri Surabaya, Indonesia

ABSTRACT

Government strategy in sports development is a critical foundation for preserving public health and fitness, which in turn boosts human resource production. This process begins with culturalization through the introduction of movement from an early age, mass promotion by making sports a lifestyle, looking for superior seeds through talent scouting and strengthening sports centers through a competition system, and improving performance through coaching nationally superior sports branches so that athletes can achieve the highest achievements. Sports serve as a vehicle for physical development, but they also serve to mold the nation's identity and character by instilling qualities such as discipline, sportsmanship, dynamism, and a strong work ethic. A nation's cohesiveness, integrity, and resilience are all strengthened by sports success, which also raises the nation's prestige and dignity internationally. The concepts of efficacy and fairness are not entirely reflected in the allocation of monies. In reality, certain sports organizations with a large following and a track record of success are given fewer budgetary allotments than other organizations with less substantial contributions. In addition, excessive budget plans and insufficient organizational governance were observed in some sports that received support. These findings have strategic significance for national sports management, notably in the establishment of a performance-based funding model that can be implemented by KONI at various regional levels. This study adds to the sports management literature by presenting a complete financial evaluation framework that can be used as a resource for national sports policy reform. To ensure that available finances can support the long-term enhancement of athlete performance, financing policies must be reformulated based on performance, real needs, and institutional responsibility.

Keyword : *Sport policy, national sports, master plan*

Corresponding Author:
Ellectrananda Anugerah Ash-shidiqq
University of Negeri Surabaya
Email : ellectranandaashidiqqi@unesa.ac.id



1. INTRODUCTION

It is emphasized in Article 3 of Law Number 3 of 2005 concerning the National Sports System, which states that sport serves to develop physical, spiritual, and social fitness while simultaneously shaping the character and personality of a dignified nation. As a result, the direction of sports development should be oriented towards the formation of the whole Indonesian person. The government fully recognizes the strategic role of sport, making it an essential part of its human resource development agenda. Sport itself has been shown to benefit children, adolescents, and

adults' socialization processes as well as their physical health. It also helps vulnerable populations integrate into society. Sport has been used as a tool to enhance people's quality of life all over the world (Reis, Vieira, & Sousa-Mast, 2016). Sport has even gained international attention in the context of peace and development, as seen by the growing number of organizations and institutions that address it (Kidd, 2008).

In Indonesia, the development planning system must include all national development sectors (Law No. 25 of 2004). As a result, sports development planning must be established based on specified standards to effectively manage resources, meet participation needs, satisfy stakeholders, and provide a proper reward system, including allowances for athletes (Veal, 2011). Strategic planning is critical for adapting to the dynamics of the new period, particularly in the context of sport for development and peace (SDP), which is increasingly being researched (Schulenkorf, 2012; Langer, 2015; Welty Peachey & Burton, 2017). At the micro level, the success of promoting a specific sport is largely influenced by stakeholder participation, proper tactics, and a defined development route within the planning framework (Sotiriadou, 2013).

Global trends are forcing a more complete shift in national sports management, taking into account the interplay of social, economic, and cultural factors. Lawson (2003) underlined sport's four critical roles: strengthening social networks, shaping collective identity, promoting physical and environmental health, and improving mental health. Thus, governmental investment in sports reflects national and international policy goals, one of which is to foster nationalism and sportsmanship (Hoberman, 1993; 2004). In practice, political leaders frequently use sports to build national identity (Adams, 2002; Gleaves & Llewellyn, 2014).

Indonesia's national sports system is built on the concepts of decentralization, autonomy, community engagement, professionalism, collaboration, transparency, and accountability. In the spirit of regional autonomy, each region is allowed the freedom to develop its own sporting potential. Sports administration involves both governmental and private sectors (Kay, 2013). An evaluation of the performance of elite sports programs in Flanders reveals the necessity of a planning framework for monitoring long-term policy success (De Bosscher et al., 2011). Strengthening networks among relevant parties is required to mobilize resources based on the principles of openness, synergy, and mutual benefit.

Sport is an integral element of people's daily life as a cultural practice. Although sporting activities differ by category, they continue to play a symbolic significance in subcultures (Rannikko et al., 2016). Sports policy in Indonesia should be developed with a comprehensive, long-term perspective. Sport has been regarded as a tool for social transformation that leads to a higher quality of life (Bruening et al. 2015). However, in actuality, planning is generally micro-scale, with a concentration on organizing sporting events. However, in industrialized countries, sports strategy has become a vital aspect of city and national development plans (Merlin and Choay, 2009; Roullet and Machemehl, 2016).

Decentralization emphasises the link between central and regional governments in sports management, both vertical and horizontal. Schools provide as a main platform for sports integration, not only through the physical education curriculum, but also through extracurricular activities, sports clubs, and specialist sports schools. This calls for long-term, cross-ministerial financial support. Furthermore, promoting sports from educational, community, and competitive perspectives necessitates a tiered and sustainable competition structure (Kidd, 2008; Gulbin et al., 2013). An integrated competitive system from junior to elite levels will boost the sports ecosystem and generate broad social benefits, including life skills such as teamwork, time management, communication, leadership, and problem-solving (Cronin & Allen, 2017).

As a result, Law No. 3 of 2005 on the National Sports System (SKN) requires sports development to be one of the national policy goals. This comprises clear legislation, strong governance, enough funding, and the incorporation of sports into national development. Institutional support, initiatives based on regional potential, and integrated performance

management are critical conditions for success. From an economic and business standpoint, successful sports growth demands structured, long-term, and sustainable quality, which can only be obtained by comprehensive strategic planning (Sandholm, 2005).

The direction and success of athletes are greatly influenced by funding in the sports industry. One measure of successful development in the national sports system is achievement. A long, excellent, and sustainable development process is reflected in achievement, which is more than just the outcome of a medal. Funds must be distributed by KONI, the organization charged with assisting the growth of competitive sports through budget allocation, according to objective standards that take into account the accomplishments or projected accomplishments of athletes. Unfortunately, money allocations are frequently dependent on political affiliation or the popularity of a sport, rather than performance evaluations. The funding process must be based on performance statistics and periodic evaluations of training programs, rather than just formal bids. (Djoko Pekik Irianto, 2021).

Sports are more than simply about winning; they also help people develop their character, social skills, and cultural awareness. Grassroots sports have a huge impact on promoting a healthy lifestyle and developing potential athletes. The Indonesian National Sports Committee (KONI) frequently has a quandary when it comes to sponsoring popular sports that do not necessarily deliver medals in international events. Mass participation should be positioned as an added benefit or supporting variable in funding programs, rather than the main premise.

One of the problems that frequently arises in budget submissions to the Indonesian Sports Committee (KONI) is the disproportionate nature of the proposed costs compared to actual needs. Overpricing in budget proposals often arises from the lack of uniform cost standards and a lack of financial literacy within sports organizations. Excessively high budget proposals are often not accompanied by detailed and logical activity plans. As a result, KONI struggles to select proposals based on their urgency and potential impact on performance development.

Sports organizations (*cabor*) are the technical implementers of athlete development programs. The quality and professionalism of these organizations are crucial factors in the effective use of KONI's allocated funds. Classical issues such as dual leadership, internal conflicts, or unclear legality often render grant funds ineffective and even give rise to the potential for misappropriation.

2. RESEARCH METHOD/MATERIAL AND METHOD/LITERATURE REVIEW

This study adopts a **mixed-methods approach** with an *exploratory sequential design*—starting with a document review and policy analysis to map the current conditions, legal frameworks, and existing initiatives, followed by the collection of primary data to enrich the findings. The document sample includes sports-related legislation, ministerial and institutional strategic plans, reports from national and regional sports organizations, and selected provincial/city case studies representing different capacities (e.g., Jakarta, East Java, and border regions). For primary data, purposive sampling is applied through in-depth interviews with key stakeholders (Ministry of Youth and Sports officials, NOC/NSC, sports federation managers, coaches/athletes, local government representatives, and sports NGOs), complemented by a quantitative survey distributed among practitioners, coaches, and the public to capture perceptions of policy priorities. Additional participatory observation is conducted at sports facilities and local programs.

Data collection employs standardized instruments: semi-structured interview guides, validated questionnaires (through divergence/pilot testing), and structured observation sheets. Qualitative analysis is conducted using *thematic coding* (with NVivo or similar software) to identify key policy themes, institutional barriers, and strategic opportunities. Quantitative analysis consists of descriptive statistics and simple inferential tests (e.g., chi-square or logistic regression where relevant) to explore correlations between policy priorities and demographic or institutional

variables. Validity and reliability are ensured through data triangulation, peer debriefing, and pilot testing, while ethical considerations (informed consent, anonymization, and institutional clearance) are strictly observed. The integration of qualitative and quantitative findings will provide operational recommendations and a structured outline for the *National Sports Master Plan*, ensuring context-based priorities, measurable targets, and feasible mechanisms for implementation and evaluation at both national and regional levels.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Sports development is a lengthy process that includes instructional, recreational, and performance sports in equal measure. The synergy of these three domains occurs through methodical, tiered, and ongoing stages, beginning with cultivation, marketing, cultivation, and improving performance that create the pyramid of national sports development and development. The Sport Development Index (SDI) or Sports Development Index (SDI) is used as an evaluation tool to assess sports development achievements. SDI is a composite index that describes the level of success of sports development based on four measurable dimensions: (1) availability of open space; (2) quality of human resources or sports personnel; (3) level of community participation in regular exercise; and (4) level of community physical fitness (Cholik & Maksum, 2007).

Sport is no longer considered merely as a physical activity for educational, health, enjoyment, or skill development, but also as a tool to improve one's quality of life in a healthy, modern, and cultural manner. This shift in meaning is consistent with the new paradigm that sports development also entails national development through sport, as evidenced by the global topic of sport for development and peace (SDP), which has been extensively researched in numerous nations (Kidd, 2008).

Sports are also thought to help build critical thinking skills. According to Humphries (2017), every sporting action has concepts, principles, tactics, and strategies that are expressed in key elements including memorizing, understanding, implementing, analyzing, evaluating, and producing. SDP itself provides a practical way to establishing sports programs that are interwoven with holistic development rather than simply using sport as a tool (Darnell and Dao, 2017). Sport in the SDP framework is used as a tool of intervention to promote greater social goals, beyond only the sporting successes itself (Giulianotti, Hognestad, & Spaaij, 2016).

The use of sports science, research and development, talent identification, boosting supporting resources, accrediting coaching systems, training sports volunteers, bolstering sports governance, creating sports organizations, creating sports for individuals with disabilities, boosting academic and vocational educational institutions' capacity, maintaining traditional sports, and growing sponsorships are further supporting aspects of sports development. These elements must all work together to create long-term development priorities. (Ma'mun, 2014).

Regardless, finance remains a challenge. Ideally, financial allocations should match athletes' performance goals and achievements in each sport. However, data show that funding levels do not necessarily correspond to achievements. Whitewater rafting, for example, received the most financing at Rp446 million, but athletics and pencak silat are more active in competitions and consistently win medals at the regional and national levels. This issue points to a mismatch between the funding structure and athlete performance indicators. Without performance-based funding, long-term development goals will be difficult to attain.

Furthermore, the quality of a sports organization's management affects financial allocation. Branches with strong management and well-planned initiatives typically receive more funding. However, data demonstrate that not all branches with big budgets have adequate institutional capacity. In contrast, other branches display competent management, transparent activity reports, and consistent performance while receiving less financing. This mismatch highlights the necessity for an objective mechanism to assess the institutional readiness of sports branches as a basis for providing help.

4. CONCLUSION

Sports development is planned using a national sports management, coaching, and development system based on the premise of regional autonomy. This method seeks to maximize local potential while allowing for independent community participation in sport development. The connection between the central and regional administrations is explicitly defined, outlining each party's rights, obligations, authorities, and responsibilities. Coordination occurs both vertically between central and regional governments and horizontally between relevant agencies at different levels.

Comprehensive, organized, quantifiable, long-term, and sustainable planning must serve as the foundation for any implemented policy. According to this framework, national development policy places sports development as a high priority issue. It is also supported by regulations that control the conceptual underpinnings, strategy, governance, and allocation of power and responsibility among stakeholders, including proper budgetary allocation.

Long-term planning's vision, mission, strategy, policy direction, and programs highlight the importance of sport as a development tool (development through sport) as well as a development goal (development of sport).

REFERENCES

- Adams, I. (2002). Pancasila: Sport and the Building of Indonesia- Ambitions and Obstacles. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*. Available Online: 08 Sep 2010. Downloaded by [Universiti Teknologi Malaysia] from Routledge Taylor & Francis, 19(Iss. 2-3), 295–318. <https://doi.org/10.1080/714001759>
- Binns, T., & Nel, E. (2002). Devolving Development: Integrated Development Planning and Developmental Local Government in Post-apartheid South Africa. *Regional Studies*, 36(8), 921–932. <https://doi.org/10.1080/0034340022000012342>
- Bloodworth, A., Mcnamee, M., Bailey, R., Bloodworth, A., Mcnamee, M., & Bailey, R. (2012). Sport, physical activity and well-being: an objectivist account Sport, physical activity and well-being: an objectivist account, (October 2014), 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13573322.2011.608948>
- Bruening, JE, Peachey, JW, Evanovich, JM, Fuller, RD, Murty, CJC, Percy, VE, ... Chung, M. (2015). Managing sport for social change: The effects of intentional design and structure in a sport-based service learning initiative. *Sport Management Review*, 18(1), 69–85. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2014.07.002>
- Cronin, L.D., & Allen, J. (2017). Development and initial validation of the Life Skills Scale for Sport. *Psychology of Sport and Exercise*, 28, 105–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.psychsport.2016.11.001>
- Darnell, S. C., & Dao, M. (2017). Considering sport for development and peace through the capabilities approach. *Third World Thematics: A TWQ Journal*, 2014(September), 1–14. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23802014.2017.1314772>
- De Bosscher, V., Shilbury, D., Theeboom, M., van Hoecke, J., & de Knop, P. (2011). Effectiveness of National Elite Sport Policies: A Multidimensional Approach Applied to the Case of Flanders. *European Sport Management Quarterly*, 2(October 2016), 115–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/16184742.2011.559133>
- Giulianotti, R., Hognestad, H., & Spaaij, R. (2016). Sport for Development and Peace: Power, Politics, and Patronage. *Journal of Global Sport Management*, 1(3–4), 129–141. <https://doi.org/10.1080/24704067.2016.1231926>
- Gleaves, J., & Llewellyn, M. (2014). Ethics, Nationalism, and the Imagined Community: The Case Against Inter-National Sport. *Journal of the Philosophy of Sport*, 41(1), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00948705.2013.785427>

- Gulbin, J.P., Croser, M.J., Morley, E.J., & Weissensteiner, J.R. (2013). An integrated framework for the optimization of sport and athlete development: a practitioner approach. *Journal of Sports Sciences*, 31(12), 1319–31. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02640414.2013.781661>
- Hoberman, J., 1993. Sport and ideology in the post-communist age. In: L. Allison, ed. *What is changing is the politics of sport*. Manchester: Manchester University Press, 15–36.
- Hoberman, J., 2004. Sportive nationalism and globalization. In: J. Bale and MK Christensen, eds.
- Humphries, C. (2017). *Critical Thinking in Physical Education*, 4562(October). <https://doi.org/10.1080/08924562.2014.938877>
- Kay, J. (2013). “Maintaining the Traditions of British Sport”? The Private Sports Club in the Twentieth Century. *The International Journal of the History of Sport*, 30(14), 1655–1669. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09523367.2013.831839>. Ministry of Youth and Sports of the Republic of Indonesia. 2010. Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 3 of 2005 concerning the National Sports System.
- Ministry of State Secretary of the Republic of Indonesia, 2007: Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 25 of 2004 concerning the National Development Planning System (SPPN).
- Kidd, B. (2008). A new social movement: Sport for development and peace. *Sport in Society*, 11(4), 370–380. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17430430802019268>
- Lyras, A., & Welty Peachey, J. (2011). Integrating sport-for-development theory and praxis. *Sport Management Review*, 14(4), 311–326. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2011.05.006>
- Ma'mun, A. (2014). Perspectives on Sports Development Policy in the Era of Democracy and National Leadership in Indonesia. *Journal of Educational Studies*, 4(2), 131–146.
- Park, J., Lim, S., Park, J., & Lim, S. (2016). A chronological review of the development of elite sport policy in South Korea. *Sport in Society*, 18(3), 599(March). <https://doi.org/10.1080/21640599.2015.1127941>
- Reis, AC, Vieira, MC, & Sousa-Mast, FR de. (2016). “Sport for Development” in developing countries: The case of the Vilas Olímpicas do Rio de Janeiro. *Sport Management Review*, 19(2), 107–119. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2015.01.005>
- Roult, R., & Machemehl, C. (2016). Territorial development and planning of sporting and leisure facilities/Aménagement et planification territoriale des installations sportives et de loisir. *Loisir et Société / Society and Leisure*, 39(1), 1–11. <https://doi.org/10.1080/07053436.2016.1151227>
- Rowe, N. F. (2014). International Journal of Sport Policy Sporting capital : a theoretical and empirical analysis of sport participation determinants and its application to sports development policy and practice, (February 2015), 37–41. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2014.915228>
- Sandholm, L. (2005). Strategic plan for sustainable excellence. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, 16(8–9), 1061–1068. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14783360500163284>
- Schulenkorf, N. (2012). Sustainable community development through sport and events: A conceptual framework for Sport-for-Development projects. *Sport Management Review*, 15(1), 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2011.06.001>
- Sherry, E., Schulenkorf, N., & Chalip, L. (2015). Managing sport for social change: The state of play. *Sport Management Review*, 18(1), 1–5. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2014.12.001>
- Sotiriadou, P. (2013). Sport development planning: The Sunny Golf Club. *Sport Management Review*, 16(4), 514–523. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2012.09.002>
- Veal, A. J. J. (2011). Planning for leisure, sport, tourism and the arts: goals and rationales. *World Leisure Journal*, 53(2), 119–148. <https://doi.org/10.1080/04419057.2011.580553>
- Welty Peachey, J., & Burton, L. (2017). Servant Leadership in Sport for Development and Peace: A Way Forward. *Quest*, 69(1), 125–139. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00336297.2016.1165123>

Yamamoto, M.Y. (2012). International Journal of Sport Policy Development of the sporting nation : sport as a strategic area of national policy in Japan. *International Journal of Sport Policy and Politics*, 4(July), 277–296. <https://doi.org/10.1080/19406940.2012.685489>.