



# Critical Analysis of Decentralization Theory in the Context of Local Government: A Literature Review

Fifi Febriandiela<sup>1\*</sup>, Aldri Frinaldi<sup>2</sup>, Lince Magriasti<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1,2,3</sup>Master of Public Administration, Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia

Coressponding: [fififebriandiela1702@gmail.com](mailto:fififebriandiela1702@gmail.com)

## ARTICLE INFO

### Keywords:

Critical analysis;  
Decentralization theory; Local government, Literature review.

## ABSTRACT

This article examines multiple elements that impact the outcome of decentralization in the context of local governance. The success of decentralization is heavily contingent upon the robustness of regional institutions, the political dynamics at play, and the unique attributes of the country undertaking the reform, as indicated by a comprehensive analysis of existing literature. Efficient decentralization necessitates well-defined institutional procedures, political solid and civil determination, enhancement of capabilities, and democratic governance. Nevertheless, notable obstacles include the possibility of heightened corruption, involvement from local politics, and discrepancies between the legal framework and real-world implementation. Hence, meticulous planning, contextual adaptations, and vigilant supervision are vital to guarantee accountability and effectiveness in executing decentralization. A literature review conducted with consistent and suitable methodological approaches is a form of qualitative research, specifically within the realm of literature study. This is employed inductively to prevent the emergence of more inquiries. The rationale behind undertaking qualitative research lies in its inherent exploratory nature. A comprehensive analysis is conducted in the part dedicated to the relevant literature or literature review. The research findings indicate that decentralization is an intricate and thorough approach whose effectiveness heavily relies on each nation's social, political, and economic circumstances. Robust and responsible local institutions guarantee high-quality public services and mitigate corruption. Decentralization strategies necessitate customization to suit the unique circumstances of each country since a uniform strategy will not be effective universally. The local political dynamics heavily influence the success of decentralization. The effects of decentralization can be influenced by cultural identities and ideological differences, which can affect community trust and involvement and potentially lead to exclusion and instability. Implementing decentralization frequently encounters substantial obstacles, such as the possibility of heightened corruption and political instability.

## 1. Introduction

The philosophy of decentralization, especially about local administration, has been thoroughly examined from several perspectives, uncovering the possible advantages and inherent difficulties. The theory posits that decentralisation, characterized by the transfer of authority from a central entity to local governments, can enhance management

performance and decision-making efficiency by granting lower-level managers the power to promptly and efficiently solve regional issues (Wu, 2023). Empirical research from Italy confirms that fiscal decentralization positively correlates with municipal efficiency. This indicates that when spending and revenue decision-making are aligned, local governance can be enhanced (Trisnaningasih & Ariadi, 2022).

Nevertheless, the correlation between decentralization and economic growth is intricate and inconsistent. For instance, although specific research indicates that the decentralization of revenue and fiscal independence are linked to improved development results, the evidence regarding expenditure decentralization is inconclusive (Eprianto, 2023). Within the Chinese setting, competition among local governments has emerged as a significant catalyst for economic progress, underscoring the importance of decentralization in fostering competitive local administration (Bucci et al., 2024). Research conducted in OECD nations reveals that there is not necessarily a direct relationship between decentralization and tax independence. This implies that the advantages of devolution can differ depending on the particular administrative and fiscal systems in operation (Semmerling et al., 2022). In Indonesia, the performance accountability of local government is greatly influenced by factors such as regulatory compliance, human resource competency, and budget clarity. This highlights the crucial role of a robust institutional framework in achieving the advantages of decentralization (Hoesein et al., 2022). Furthermore, the decentralization reforms in Ukraine exemplify the ongoing challenge of finding a harmonious equilibrium between local autonomy and state authority, underscoring the necessity for ongoing legislative enhancements to enhance local self-governance (Zhuravel, 2008). The combination of decentralization and sustainability initiatives in Africa is not well-developed, revealing deficiencies in utilizing local governance for sustainable development. (Canare, 2021). In general, decentralization can potentially enhance local governance and development results. However, its effectiveness is mainly determined by the particular political, economic, and institutional circumstances in which it is implemented (Atisa et al., 2021).

The concept of decentralization has been a prominent topic in government and public administration, particularly in emerging nations. In Indonesia, decentralization has been continuously taking place since the reform era by enacting different legislation and policies established by the central government. This study seeks to conduct a thorough analysis of the

theory and application of decentralization in Indonesia, specifically examining its various aspects, its effects, and the difficulties encountered throughout its implementation (Christia & Ispriyarso, 2019; Devas, 1997; Fauziyah, 2020). This literature review will examine four key elements: (1) the definition and attributes of decentralization; (2) the execution of decentralization in Indonesia; (3) the influence of decentralization on local government dynamics; and (4) the obstacles and crucial concerns in the implementation of decentralization. Within the framework of public administration theory, decentralization refers to the transfer of power and accountability from the central government to local or regional administrations. (Christia & Ispriyarso, 2019; Devas, 1997; Wijayanti, 2016). Nevertheless, the practical application of this concept in real-world situations demonstrates intricate interactions, resulting in both advantageous and disadvantageous consequences for local governance.

Decentralization in public administration possesses distinct traits that set it apart from other notions. (Wijayanti, 2016). These sources categorize decentralization into many types, including territorial, functional, political, and cultural. (Devas, 1997; Wijayanti, 2016). This demonstrates that decentralization is a multifaceted notion that has intricate ramifications for the dynamics of regional governance. In Indonesia, decentralization has been implemented through a range of rules and policies introduced during the reform era. The diverse regulatory modifications demonstrate the central government's endeavour to adjust the execution of decentralization to the governmental circumstances and socio-political dynamics in the areas. The laws and regulations pertaining to decentralization in Indonesia have evolved, beginning with Law Number 5 of 1975, which outlined the fundamental principles of regional government, and culminating in Law Number 23 of 2014, which explicitly addresses regional government (Christia & Ispriyarso, 2019; Fauziyah, 2020).

This literature study seeks to examine the dynamics and difficulties associated with the implementation of decentralization in Indonesia while also exploring the consequences for local government governance. By acquiring a

thorough grasp of the concept of decentralization and examining its implementation in Indonesia, valuable insights can be obtained to enhance the development of more efficient decentralization policies and practices in the future. Conducting this research is crucial for advancing public administration theory, particularly in relation to the concept of decentralization and its effects on local government. There are still significant gaps in our understanding that can be addressed through a more comprehensive investigation.

## 2. Literature Review

### Decentralization Concept

Decentralization is the transfer of responsibility and power to carry out part or all of the central government's and its institutions' management and administration tasks. This can include government employees or businesses operating with some degree of autonomy, functional authority with a regional or local focus, and non-governmental organizations. (Hutchcroft, 2001). "Decentralisation means the transfer or handover of planning, decision making or management authority from the central government and its representatives to field organisations, lower government units, public legal entities, regional authorities and regional, functional experts, or to non-governmental organisations," according to Rondenelli (2017), who also expressed the same idea.

Political and public administration specialists from Indonesia also explained decentralization. Hendratno (2009) is one of them, and he describes decentralization as the transfer of power from the national level to local governments that run their own homes (independent regions). The establishment of regional governance, in which the regional government controls and oversees its governmental matters, is the transfer of power to autonomous areas in the form of regional autonomy. With these decentralized responsibilities, regional governments can assist the national government in managing the nation in their separate regions, which is why it is thought that they can hasten the realization of community welfare (independent areas).

As per Noor (2012) citation of the UNDP, decentralization pertains to the reorganization or restructuring of authority in order to establish a shared responsibility system between central and regional government institutions based on the principle of subsidiarity. The ultimate goal of this process is to enhance the overall quality and efficacy of the government system while simultaneously augmenting authority and regional capacity. Decentralization is expected to open doors for the development of good governance by, among other things, giving people more chances to engage in social, political, and economic decision-making, supporting their still-developing capacities, and raising the standards of accountability, responsibility, and transparency. According to Malysheva (2012), decentralization involves assigning management responsibilities to other authorities to move power from the national to the regional or local level. A reform package aimed at boosting public sector efficiency, fostering competition among regional governments in the provision of public services, and promoting economic growth is believed to include fiscal decentralization, or the transfer of budgetary authority from the federal government to regional governments (Bahl & Linn, 1987).

Drawing from the diverse perspectives surrounding decentralization discussed above, decentralization can be understood as the process of transferring authority and responsibility that were formerly under the purview of the national or central government to local or regional governments, making these issues the province of the regional government. Based on the degree of power granted to regional administrations, decentralization can be roughly classified into four categories:

1. Deconcentration refers to the transfer of administrative authorities and responsibilities from higher levels to lower ones within government ministries.
2. Delegation refers to the act of transferring responsibility for specific activities to an external entity that operates independently from the central authority.
3. Devolution refers to the process of establishing and empowering government entities at the national level, which carry out

significant functions primarily based on central government offices.

4. Privatization involves the transfer of responsibilities and functions from the government to non-governmental organizations or independent commercial corporations (Rondinelli, 2017).

Rondinelli (2017) presented an additional viewpoint, categorizing decentralization into different categories based on the specific areas of responsibility granted to regional governments. These types include:

1. Political decentralization refers to the transfer of authority to the general populace and their elected representatives in the process of making public decisions.
2. Decentralization of Administration, in the form of delegation of authority for public services to other parties in the State institutional structure.
3. Fiscal decentralization refers to the process of enhancing financial performance by making reasonable decisions regarding revenue generation and expenditure allocation.
4. Economic or market decentralization refers to the process of creating a more favourable business climate and delivering goods and services that are responsive to local demands and market forces.

In addition, Simanjuntak (2015) categorized decentralization into three distinct forms based on the specific areas of authority granted to regional governments: political decentralization, administrative decentralization, and fiscal decentralization. These three forms are interconnected and should be implemented in conjunction with one another. Decentralization is necessary to attain the objectives of regional autonomy, such as regional sovereignty.

From the perspectives above, decentralization can be categorized into two aspects: the level of authority granted to regional governments and the specific areas of authority delegated to them. The categorization of devolution, as previously explained, can be condensed into three distinct types: deconcentration, delegation, and devolution. These three types encompass all present forms of decentralization. Meanwhile, the categorization

of devolution based on the extent of authority granted to regional governments, as described earlier from multiple sources, is typically classified into three types: administrative decentralization, fiscal decentralization, and political decentralization.

### **Regional Government Concept**

The legal foundation for Regional Government in Indonesia has experienced significant transformations, beginning with Law Number 22 of 1999 concerning Regional Government and culminating in the latest update to Law Number 23 of 2014, which has introduced substantial modifications to the regulation of regional government. According to Article 1 Paragraph 2 of Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government, regional government is the execution of government affairs by the regional government and DPRD, based on the principle of autonomy and assistance duties, with the highest level of autonomy possible within the principles of the State. The 1945 Constitution of Indonesia aims to establish the unity of the Republic of Indonesia.

The term "regional government" refers to the regional head who serves as an organizer and is responsible for leading the execution of government affairs within the autonomous region's jurisdiction. Regional government refers to the management of regional affairs and the Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD) in accordance with the principles of decentralization and deconcentration. This word encompasses the processes and activities involved in this administration (Rahayu, 2022). Regional heads play a crucial role in the government system by overseeing regional government administration (Fauzi, 2019). According to Siallagan & Siregar (2023), the regional head plays a crucial role in organizing the representative parts of the regional government process. The primary role of regional government is to provide protection, provision of public services, and promotion of development. Thus, regional chiefs must fulfil these three governmental functions while doing their duties.

### 3. Methods

This article primarily focuses on reviewing studies published in numerous prominent national and international journals explicitly pertaining to decentralization in the context of regional administration. A literature review, when conducted with consistent and proper methodological approaches, falls within the category of qualitative research and is a specific sort of literature study. This is employed inductively to prevent the emergence of more inquiries. The rationale for undertaking qualitative research lies in its inherent exploratory nature. Following that, a comprehensive analysis is conducted in the part dedicated to the relevant literature or literature review.

### 4. Result

#### The Power of Decentralization Theory

The notion of decentralization posits that the allocation of authority from central authorities to local bodies can enhance the efficiency and responsiveness of governance. This notion is substantiated by a range of advantages, including improved public services, heightened accountability, and increased citizen participation (Klibanoff & Poitevin, 2022). Decentralization can foster innovation by granting local governments the freedom to explore novel methodologies (Fard Bahreini et al., 2021). Nevertheless, the actual execution of decentralization is intricate and contingent on the specific circumstances. In the context of forest governance, successful decentralization necessitates collaboration and knowledge exchange among stakeholders rather than the use of force (Elliott, 2022). The definition of decentralization in blockchain technology, from a relational perspective, emphasizes the importance of considering data, technological, and social aspects. It stresses the disruption of current power structures and the necessity of trust dynamics (Omala & Aglanu, 2020).

Moreover, the integration of democratic decentralization and party centralization with devolution in the political system might result in enhanced provision of public goods (Wadipalapa, 2017). Although devolution has the

potential for positive outcomes, it can also lead to centralization consequences. Therefore, a comprehensive comprehension of power dynamics is necessary (Bodó et al., 2021). The fluid nature of decentralization is exemplified by historical power swings between central and local governments, as observed in China (Ponce-Rodríguez et al., 2018). Furthermore, the objective of decentralization's empowerment component is to eradicate socio-economic and political obstacles, hence enhancing local autonomy and engagement (Dick-Sago, 2020).

Nevertheless, the effectiveness of decentralization relies on the policies of the central government, the ability of local institutions, and the political framework (Uddin, 2017). The stability of decentralized networks can be precarious, as evidenced by the potential dangers of political consolidation linked to social networking technology (Cao, 2018). The effectiveness of decentralization in addressing externalities, such as environmental effects, is contingent upon the allocation of private and external advantages. The effectiveness of decentralization relies on meticulous design and adaptation that is tailored to the individual circumstances.

The literature on decentralization theory highlights numerous advantages, focusing on its ability to enhance governance, service delivery, and socioeconomic conditions. A significant benefit is the enhancement of managerial performance by delegating responsibility and authority, which enables effective decision-making and problem-solving at lower levels of management (Trisnaningsih & Ariadi, 2022). Decentralization is regarded as a means to enhance rural development by efficiently addressing local requirements, as long as variables such as local budget formation, social capital, and community engagement are included (Sutiyo et al., 2017). These factors can enhance political competitiveness, improve public accountability, and mitigate political instability, ultimately enhancing governance. (Faguet, 2014). Furthermore, proponents of decentralization claim that it can enhance the democratization of governance by promoting greater participation and responsibility. This, in turn, has the potential to alleviate poverty and

improve the delivery of services (Robinson, 2007). Empirical data demonstrates that decentralization can enhance the quality of local public services under certain circumstances, including competitive elections, transparency, and community social capital (Sujarwoto, 2017). This allows regional governments to customize service provision to fit local conditions, giving local communities more political, economic, and societal influence (Mudalige, 2019). The growing inclination towards decentralization in different regions, such as post-socialist nations and developing democracies, underscores its significance in enhancing the delivery of public goods and services by matching them with the specific requirements of local communities (Garman et al., 2001). The literature explores the advantages of decentralization regarding welfare, explicitly focusing on preference matching and technological efficiency in delivering public services (Lockwood, 1998; Odoom, 2016). Furthermore, decentralization is promoted to enhance public engagement and local governance, enhancing socioeconomic circumstances and facilitating poverty alleviation (Channa & Faguet, 2016). The research emphasizes decentralization has significant theoretical advantages, but its effectiveness relies on certain contextual elements and implementation conditions.

Decentralization theory presents a range of possible advantages in enhancing efficiency, accountability, and participation in local governance. This theoretical framework emphasizes the significance of decentralization in improving governance, public services, and socio-economic circumstances, particularly by promoting managerial effectiveness, political engagement, and rural advancement. Nevertheless, achieving decentralization involves intricate and demanding obstacles that rely heavily on specific circumstances. To succeed, decentralization necessitates meticulous planning and contextual adjustment while considering power dynamics, local capabilities, and central government policies. While decentralization offers numerous theoretical advantages, achieving these benefits generally relies on the proper implementation circumstances and a supportive environment.

### **Weaknesses and Criticism of Decentralization Theory**

The concept of decentralization, while theoretically appealing, encounters several objections and drawbacks when put into practice. A significant critique is that decentralization frequently falls short of anticipated levels of widespread involvement, particularly among marginalized demographics such as women, the impoverished, and individuals with disabilities, primarily due to structural obstacles such as policies that do not consider gender, insufficient socioeconomic resources, and cultural norms (Mohammed, 2016). Furthermore, the hypothesis that actual data do not consistently substantiate decentralization results in enhanced local service provision (Dick-Sago, 2020). Detractors contend that decentralization cannot be universally applied and should be customized to suit each nation's unique social, political, and economic circumstances (Chulu, 2015). Moreover, discrepancies between the legislative framework and the practical execution frequently weaken the efficacy of decentralization, resulting in a shortage of substantial democratic elements in newly established institutions (Chhatre, 2007). This theory also presupposes local administrations will exhibit greater accountability and efficiency, contingent upon a broader democratic framework and heightened institutional responsibility (Shapiro & Koren, 2012). This theory also presupposes local administrations will exhibit greater accountability and efficiency, contingent upon a broader democratic framework and heightened institutional responsibility (Tacconi et al., 2006). Fiscal decentralization, although theoretically offering the opportunity for enhanced resource allocation and innovation, is nevertheless confronted with obstacles such as corruption at the local level, political instability in local governments, and the risk of harmful competition among them (Oates, 2006; Umam, 2011). In general, whereas decentralization may seem appealing in theory, its implementation exposes notable constraints and intricacies that must be addressed to achieve its potential advantages fully.

While primarily supported for enhancing local governance, the principle of decentralization encounters substantial constraints when implemented in different situations. During crises like the Covid-19 outbreak, decentralization has exposed difficulties such as strained relationships between national and local authorities, limited resources, and diverse regional reactions. These obstacles necessitate the implementation of more inventive and situation-specific solutions (Erkoreka & Hernando-Pérez, 2023). In China, decentralization in land development has resulted in local governments giving more importance to economic growth than sustainable land use. However, their decisions are limited by central regulations such as land quotas and nomenclatura, which demonstrate a decentralization model with certain limitations (Lu & Wang, 2022). The case of South Korea demonstrates that despite advancements in democracy, inadequate local administrative and fiscal capabilities have resulted in heightened reliance on the central government and exacerbated regional disparities, posing a threat to local democracy. (Bae et al., 2016). In the European context, fiscal decentralization prioritizes the idea of subsidiarity. However, it frequently faces challenges in generating enough local income to align with decentralized spending, resulting in insolvency issues (Bukharskiy & Lavrov, 2021). In Africa, decentralization has not achieved sustainable development, failing to reach economic, social, and environmental prosperity. This is partially because of the absence of specific national efforts and inadequate local involvement (Atisa et al., 2021). Theoretical concepts of decentralization and citizen participation frequently do not result in tangible enhancements in local governance, underscoring the necessity for specific evaluation and execution (Kessy, 2013). Detractors contend that decentralization cannot be universally applied since its effectiveness is contingent upon each nation's unique social, political, and economic circumstances, necessitating robust political determination and local mechanisms of responsibility (Chulu, 2015). The restrictions on revenue and expenditure autonomy in Poland have resulted in decentralized duties being eclipsed by regulated obligations, creating

challenges in local financial management (Kopańska, 2018). Smaller emerging nations like South Africa and Lesotho encounter the complex obstacles of swift urbanization, limited resources, and partial decentralization of authority, impeding efficient local governance and sustained progress (Daemane, 2012). Ultimately, discrepancies between legal frameworks and real-world implementation in democratic decentralization can lead to inefficiencies and delays, undermining local self-government's intended advantages (Obaoye, 2016).

Decentralization theory presents numerous theoretical advantages in enhancing local governance, public services, and socio-economic circumstances. Nevertheless, decentralization encounters substantial criticism and obstacles, such as restricted public involvement, inconsistency with empirical data, discrepancies between the legislative structure and execution, and issues related to accountability and efficiency. Empirical evidence from several nations demonstrates that the effectiveness of decentralization is primarily contingent upon each country's unique social, political, and economic circumstances, as well as the capacity to tailor policies to suit local conditions. To fully harness the advantages of decentralization, it is essential to have meticulous planning, unwavering determination from political leaders, and efficient mechanisms for ensuring responsibility.

### **Factors influencing the success or failure of decentralization**

The outcome of decentralization is contingent upon various elements, such as the robustness of local institutions, political dynamics, and the unique attributes of the country undertaking the transformation. In post-conflict circumstances, weak local institutions can compromise accountability and result in substandard public services. This occurs when elites utilize competition to undermine local administration deliberately (Colombo, 2020). Efficient decentralization necessitates well-defined institutional procedures, political and civil determination, capacity enhancement, and democratic governance (Crook & Manor, 2018).

The impact of local political action on success can vary, as seen by the divergent outcomes in the Jembrana and Banyuwangi districts in Indonesia. (Sjamsuddin & Noor, 2012). The case of Croatia exemplifies the drawbacks of a hierarchical strategy, in which the country's low financial resources and the absence of local involvement result in minimal achievements (Olum, 2014; Sutiyo et al., 2017). Furthermore, it is crucial to tailor decentralization to the specific circumstances of each locality, as a uniform strategy is ineffective (Petak, 2011). Another significant element to consider is the possibility of heightened corruption, as decentralization can often result in increased corruption due to several decision-making centers and a lack of effective horizontal accountability (Conteh, 2016). Effective decentralization is contingent upon the active involvement of the community, the presence of social capital, and the inclusion of local budget formulation (Petak, 2011). The decentralization of health care in Sierra Leone has been inefficient due to varied political and legal frameworks and pushback from the central government (Chulu, 2015). The overall effect of decentralization on rural development and public service delivery is varied, with its success contingent upon the meticulous execution and synchronization of local and national objectives (Matei & Popa, 2010).

Cultural disparities substantially affect the results of decentralization by shaping governance's political and economic aspects. Regional cultural identification can foster trust and economic engagement among indigenous residents. Still, it can also marginalize non-indigenous workers and confine indigenous individuals to their territory, resulting in less-than-optimal levels of dispersed expenditure on cultural identity (Mulia, 2022). The ideological stance of political parties also influences their viewpoint, with cultural liberal parties preferring decentralization over conservative parties. However, the degree of regional self-governance and economic inequalities can potentially modify this preference (Toubeau & Wagner, 2015). In multinational federations, profound societal divisions give rise to centrifugal pressures that propel increased decentralization as subnational communities strive for greater autonomy to preserve their cultural identities (Wallner, 2009).

Decentralization can result in diverse economic outcomes. For instance, in Finland, the dispersion of wages is influenced differently for blue and white-collar workers due to decentralized bargaining, which reflects their distinct preferences (Kauhanen et al., 2020). The effect on student academic performance also differs depending on the decentralization tactics employed, which are, in turn, influenced by the cultural milieu (Teng & Tsang, 2024). In nations characterized by substantial cultural divisions, decentralization can worsen fiscal and political instability, necessitating increased amounts of central redistribution to avert regional uprisings (Treisman, 1999). Managers' perception of how helpful information is can be influenced by the cultural and environmental setting in which they operate. This, in turn, can affect the success of decentralized decision-making (Mangaliso et al., 2010). Decentralization in developing nations seeks to enhance the effectiveness and fairness of services. Still, it can also lead to a rise in corruption when local elites gain control over public institutions (Matei & Popa, 2010). Fiscal decentralization is frequently implemented in response to requests for regional self-governance motivated by cultural and linguistic differences, particularly in developing nations (Morales et al., 2017). Decentralization in Western democracies is typically linked to pluralism and the protection of minority rights. However, in some situations, it can also reinforce the concentration of power among local elites, making the final result more intricate (Fossati, 2023). Hence, cultural disparities influence the efficacy, fairness, and durability of decentralization in many manners.

Decentralization is an intricate and diverse technique shaped by several circumstances and individual contexts. The outcome of decentralization is influenced not only by well-meaning intentions or optimal policy formulation but also by the local ability to implement it, political factors, and various cultural environments. Solid and responsible local institutions are necessary for decentralization. Without this, local governments may experience a deficiency in delivering high-quality public service or even resort to corruption and misuse of authority. Decentralization strategies should be tailored to the unique circumstances of each country. Due to

political, economic, and social variations, a uniform approach will not be practical in all situations. The success of decentralization hinges on the involvement of local political activity and the determination of central political authorities. The case of Indonesia demonstrates how regional dynamics can lead to contrasting results within a similar setting. Decentralization outcomes are also influenced by cultural identity and ideological differences. In certain regions, this phenomenon has the potential to foster trust and active involvement, yet in other areas, it may result in exclusion and instability.

Decentralization is a multifaceted instrument that necessitates a meticulous and situational approach. The effectiveness of decentralization hinges on the robustness of local institutions, budgetary capability, community engagement, and alignment with the cultural and political milieu. Although decentralization holds numerous theoretical advantages, its practical execution frequently encounters substantial obstacles, such as the possibility of heightened corruption and political instability. Hence, to optimize the benefits of decentralization, it is imperative to implement meticulous planning, adapt to specific circumstances, and closely supervise to guarantee responsibility and effectiveness.

## 5. Conclusion

This article emphasizes that decentralization is an intricate and diverse policy whose effectiveness is heavily influenced by each nation's social, political, and economic circumstances. The essay highlights several key takeaways:

1. Robust and transparent local institutions are crucial for guaranteeing high-quality public services and minimizing corruption.
2. Country-Specific Context: Decentralization strategies need to be customized to the unique circumstances of each country, as a one-size-fits-all approach will not be effective universally.
3. The success of decentralization is heavily influenced by local political dynamics.
4. Cultural and ideological identities can impact the results of decentralization, affecting factors such as community trust,

involvement, and the likelihood of exclusion and instability.

Challenges in implementing decentralization frequently involve the risk of heightened corruption and political instability.

## 6. Implications

The conclusions of this article have important consequences for policymakers, who should:

1. **Enhancing Local Institutions:** Constructing and reinforcing responsible local institutions to guarantee the effectiveness of decentralization.
2. **Contextual Adjustment** refers to the process of developing decentralization policies that are customized to suit the unique social, political, and economic circumstances of each country.
3. **Stringent Supervision:** Enforce stringent supervision measures to guarantee accountability and minimize the likelihood of corruption.
4. **Promote Community Engagement:** Enhance community involvement in the decentralization process to ensure that policies implemented align with local requirements and ambitions.
5. **Addressing Cultural and Ideological Challenges:** Developing a comprehensive understanding and practical strategies to navigate and mitigate cultural and ideological disparities, minimizing the risk of conflict and instability.

By adopting a meticulous and situational strategy, decentralization can enhance government efficacy and the caliber of public services. Nevertheless, current obstacles indicate that establishing decentralization must be executed with caution and supported by robust political determination and a proficient system of responsibility.

## References

- Atisa, G., Zemrani, A., & Weiss, M. (2021). Decentralized governments: local empowerment and sustainable development challenges in Africa. *Environment, Development and Sustainability*, 23, 3349–3367.

- Bae, Y., Joo, Y.-M., & Won, S.-Y. (2016). Decentralization and collaborative disaster governance: Evidence from South Korea. *Habitat International*, 52, 50–56.
- Bahl, R. W., & Linn, J. F. (1987). *Intergovernmental fiscal relations in developing countries*.
- Bodó, B., Brekke, J. K., & Hoepman, J.-H. (2021). Decentralisation: A multidisciplinary perspective. *Internet Policy Review*, 10(2), 1–21.
- Bucci, V., Ferrara, G., & Resce, G. (2024). Local government spending efficiency and fiscal decentralization: evidence from Italian municipalities. *Applied Economics*, 56(5), 599–614.
- Bukharskiy, V., & Lavrov, A. (2021). Intergovernmental Relations and Public Administration: Opportunities and Limitations of Decentralization. *Public Administration Issues*, 2, 126–153.
- Canare, T. (2021). Decentralization and development outcomes: What does the empirical literature really say? *Hacienda Publica Espanola*, 237, 111–151.
- Cao, Z. (2018). Centralization and decentralization of power structure: A theory of ruling risks and empirical evidence from Chinese history. *Chinese Journal of Sociology*, 4(4), 506–564.
- Channa, A., & Faguet, J.-P. (2016). Decentralization of health and education in developing countries: a quality-adjusted review of the empirical literature. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 31(2), 199–241.
- Chhatre, A. (2007). *Accountability in decentralization and the democratic context: theory and evidence from India*.
- Christia, A. M., & Ispriyarso, B. (2019). Desentralisasi fiskal dan otonomi daerah di Indonesia. *Law Reform*, 15(1), 149–163.
- Chulu, J. (2015). Decentralization: Is It a Blue Print for Local Governments in Developing Countries? Available at SSRN 2701497.
- Colombo, A. (2020). Why do local institutions matter? The political economics of decentralisation 1. *Reflets et Perspectives de La Vie Economique*, 59(1), 115–130.
- Conteh, F. M. (2016). The promise and reality of decentralization: a critical appraisal of Sierra Leone's primary health care system. *Critical African Studies*, 8(3), 350–369.
- Crook, R., & Manor, J. (2018). Democratic decentralization. In *Making Development Work* (pp. 83–104). Routledge.
- Daemane, M. M. M. (2012). Prospects and challenges of decentralization for sustainable development through Developmental Local Governance (DLG): the experience of smaller nations. *Journal of Sustainable Development in Africa*, 14(8), 199–227.
- Devas, N. (1997). Indonesia: what do we mean by decentralization? *Public Administration and Development: The International Journal of Management Research and Practice*, 17(3), 351–367.
- Dick-Sagoe, C. (2020). Decentralization for improving the provision of public services in developing countries: A critical review. *Cogent Economics & Finance*, 8(1), 1804036.
- Elliott, F. (2022). The advantages of decentralized government from the viewpoint of Public Service Innovation. *Journal of Management and Administration Provision*, 2(3), 65–72.
- Eprianto, I. (2023). Literature Review: Factors Affecting The Performance Accountability Report of Government Agencies (LAKIP) Local Government in Indonesia. *Accounting and Finance Studies*, 3(1), 1–23.
- Erkoreka, M., & Hernando-Pérez, J. (2023). Decentralization: A handicap in fighting the COVID-19 pandemic? The response of the regional governments in Spain. *Public Administration and Development*, 43(2), 129–140.
- Faguet, J. P. (2014). Decentralization and governance. *World Development*. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0305750X13000089>
- Fard Bahreini, A., Collomosse, J., Seidel, M.-D. L., Sotoudehnia, M., & Woo, C. C. (2021). Distributing and Democratizing Institutional Power Through Decentralization. *Building Decentralized Trust: Multidisciplinary Perspectives on the*

- Design of Blockchains and Distributed Ledgers*, 95–109.
- Fauzi, A. (2019). Otonomi daerah dalam kerangka mewujudkan penyelenggaraan pemerintahan daerah yang baik. *Spektrum Hukum*, 16(1), 119–136.
- Fauziyah, H. F. (2020). Kontribusi Otonomi Daerah Terhadap Eksistensi Pajak Daerah. *Jurnal Rechten: Riset Hukum Dan Hak Asasi Manusia*, 2(1), 21–27.
- Fossati, D. (2023). When conservatives support decentralization: The case of political Islam in Indonesia. *Regional & Federal Studies*, 33(2), 209–233.
- Garman, C., Haggard, S., & Willis, E. (2001). Fiscal decentralization: A political theory with Latin American cases. *World Politics*, 53(2), 205–236.
- Hendratno, E. T. (2009). *Negara Kesatuan, Desentralisasi, dan Federalisme*. Graha Ilmu.
- Hoesein, Z. A., Arifudin, A., & Rahayu, S. D. (2022). The Effectiveness of Decentralization Policy in Local Government Administration. *Jurnal Akta*, 9(2), 242–259.
- Hutchcroft, P. D. (2001). Centralization and decentralization in administration and politics: assessing territorial dimensions of authority and power. *Governance*, 14(1), 23–53.
- Kauhanen, A., Maczulskij, T., & Riukula, K. (2020). *Heterogeneous impacts of the decentralization of collective bargaining*.
- Kessy, A. (2013). Decentralization and citizens' participation: Some theoretical and conceptual perspectives. *The African Review: A Journal of African Politics, Development and International Affairs*, 215–239.
- Klibanoff, P., & Poitevin, M. (2022). A theory of (de) centralization. *Journal of Public Economic Theory*, 24(3), 417–451.
- Kopańska, A. (2018). Partial fiscal decentralization and local government spending policy. *Financial Internet Quarterly*, 14(3), 21–31.
- Lockwood, B. (1998). *Distributive politics and the benefits of decentralization*. University of Warwick, Department of Economics.
- Lu, S., & Wang, H. (2022). Limited decentralization: Understand China's land system from the perspective of central-local relation. *Land*, 11(4), 517.
- Malysheva, N. V. (2012). Main features of Russia's forest management system. In *The Politics of Decentralization* (pp. 229–237). Routledge.
- Mangaliso, M. P., Alves, J. C., Knipes, B. J., Osorio, A. E., & Mangaliso, Z. A. (2010). Culture as the Context of Environmental Uncertainty, Structural Decentralization, and Strategic Significance of Information: A Three Country Comparison. *Structural Decentralization, and Strategic Significance of Information: A Three Country Comparison (November 8, 2010)*.
- Matei, A. I., & Popa, F. M. (2010). Impact of decentralization on the corruption phenomenon. *Selected Papers in Nemeș, J., Peters, GB (Eds)*, 259–270.
- Mohammed, A. K. (2016). Decentralization and participation: theory and Ghana's evidence. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 17(2), 232–255.
- Morales, A., Letelier, L., & Platz, D. (2017). Decentralization and local government financing. *LEADERS*, 46.
- Mudalige, P. W. (2019). The discussion of theory and practice on decentralization and service delivery. *European Journal*, 15(14), 115–135.
- Mulia, R. A. (2022). Systematic Literature Review: Analisis Tren dan Tantangan Dalam Perkembangan Desentralisasi di Indonesia. *Jurnal Ilmiah Ekotrans & Erudisi*, 2(2), 49–61.
- Noor, M. (2012). Memahami Desentralisasi Indonesia. *Yogyakarta: Interpena*.
- Oates, W. E. (2006). *On the theory and practice of fiscal decentralization*.
- Obaoye, O. S. (2016). *Impact of Decentralization Reforms on Public Service Delivery at the Local Self-Government*. Šiaulių universitetas.
- Odoom, D. (2016). *Conceptualizing decentralization: Reflecting on some existing*

literature.

- Olum, Y. (2014). Decentralisation in developing countries: preconditions for successful implementation. *Commonwealth Journal of Local Governance*, 15, 23–38.
- Omala, M. A., & Aglanu, L. M. (2020). Power dynamics in forest governance decentralization: the case of Kenya. *International Forestry Review*, 22(2), 225–240.
- Petak, Z. (2011). Politics of decentralization policy: Explaining the limited success of the Croatian case after 2001. *Politička Misao: Časopis Za Politologiju*, 48(5), 72–84.
- Ponce-Rodríguez, R. A., Hankla, C. R., Martinez-Vazquez, J., & Heredia-Ortiz, E. (2018). Rethinking the political economy of decentralization: How elections and parties shape the provision of local public goods. *Publius: The Journal of Federalism*, 48(4), 523–558.
- Rahayu, A. S. (2022). *Pengantar Pemerintahan Daerah: Kajian Teori, Hukum dan Aplikasinya*. Sinar Grafika.
- Robinson, M. (2007). Does decentralisation improve equity and efficiency in public service delivery provision? *IDS Bulletin*, 38(1), 7–17.
- Rondinelli, D. A. (2017). Decentralization and development. In *International development governance* (pp. 391–404). Routledge.
- Semmerling, A., Paczoski, A., & Cirella, G. T. (2022). Decentralization and tax independence in OECD countries: GDP per capita analysis from 1995–2018. *Journal of Banking and Financial Economics*, 1 (17), 42–59.
- Shapiro, A., & Koren, A. (2012). Analyzing and critiquing the concepts of professional autonomy and accountability through the prisms of decentralization and constructivist theory. *International Journal of Educational Reform*, 21(4), 224–237.
- Siallagan, D. A. F., & Siregar, G. (2023). Peran Pemerintah Daerah Dalam Penegakan Peraturan Daerah Agar Terwujudnya Pemerintah Daerah yang Baik (Good Government). *Jurnal Ilmu Pendidikan Dan Sosial*, 2(2), 231–239.
- Simanjuntak, K. M. (2015). Implementasi kebijakan desentralisasi pemerintahan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Bina Praja: Journal of Home Affairs Governance*, 7(2), 111–130.
- Sjamsuddin, S., & Noor, I. (2012). Decentralization: a question for developing countries. *Viešoji Politika Ir Administravimas= Public Policy and Administration/Mykolo Romerio Universitetas, Kauno Technologijos Universitetas*. Vilnius: Mykolo Romerio Universitetas, 2012, t. 11, Nr. 1.
- Sujarwoto, S. (2017). Why decentralization works and does not works? A systematic literature review. *JPAS (Journal of Public Administration Studies)*, 2(1), 1–10.
- Sutiyo, Maharjan, K. L., Sutiyo, & Maharjan, K. L. (2017). Decentralization: Potential and Challenges for Rural Development. *Decentralization and Rural Development in Indonesia*, 13–26.
- Tacconi, L., Siagian, Y., & Syam, R. (2006). *On the theory of decentralization, forests and livelihoods*.
- Teng, Y., & Tsang, K. K. (2024). Educational decentralisation and students' academic achievement: a cross-cultural analysis. *Educational Studies*, 50(3), 317–340.
- Toubeau, S., & Wagner, M. (2015). Explaining party positions on decentralization. *British Journal of Political Science*, 45(1), 97–119.
- Treisman, D. (1999). Political decentralization and economic reform: a game-theoretic analysis. *American Journal of Political Science*, 488–517.
- Trisnaningsih, S., & Ariadi, D. (2022). Literature Review: Decentralization Analysis in Improving Managerial Performance. *Journal Research of Social Science, Economics, and Management*, 2(5), 884–888.
- Uddin, N. (2017). Empowerment through decentralization: conceptions, contrivances and connections. *Dynamics of Public Administration*, 34(1), 86–101.
- Umam, A. K. (2011). The Two Edge Knife of Decentralization. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik*, 15(1), 79–92.

- Wadipalapa, R. P. (2017). Dari Desentralisasi Jaringan ke [De] sentralisasi Kuasa: Dinamika, Kekuatan dan Pukulan Balik. *Jurnal ASPIKOM*, 1(6), 465–476.
- Wallner, J. M. (2009). Does Diversity Always Lead to Decentralization and Difference? *APSA 2009 Toronto Meeting Paper*.
- Wijayanti, S. N. (2016). Hubungan antara pusat dan daerah dalam negara kesatuan Republik Indonesia berdasarkan Undang-Undang Nomor 23 Tahun 2014. *Jurnal Media Hukum*, 23(2), 186–199.
- Wu, Y. (2023). A Literature Review of Local Government Competition. *Frontiers in Business, Economics and Management*, 8(1), 29–32.
- Zhuravel, Y. V. (2008). Administrative and legal status of local self-government bodies. *Extended Abstract of Candidate's Thesis, Kyev*.