

# **ADMINISTRATION CITY INSTITUTIONAL ARRANGEMENT MODEL IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF LOCAL GOVERNMENT IN INDONESIA**

<https://doi.org/10.47743/jopafl-2022-23-07>

**Dhany SUKMA**

Faculty of Administrative Sciences, Brawijaya University  
Malang, Indonesia  
*dhanysukma.ub@gmail.com*

**Sumartono**

Faculty of Administrative Sciences, Brawijaya University  
Malang, Indonesia

**Khairul MULUK**

Faculty of Administrative Sciences, Brawijaya University  
Malang, Indonesia

**Fadillah AMIN**

Faculty of Administrative Sciences, Brawijaya University  
Malang, Indonesia

**Abstract:** *The administrative city institutional model should have room for analysis related to the existence of these institutions in supporting public services in the context of regional government administration that adheres to the principle of single autonomy, one of which is DKI Jakarta Province as an autonomous region. The problem faced by administrative cities today is because the mayor's task is stronger in coordinating regional apparatus units, so that the accountability of the mayor's performance is difficult to measure. The purpose of this study was to find a model for the appropriate administrative city institutional arrangement in the administration of the DKI Jakarta Province regional government. The research method used is qualitative research with an analytical descriptive approach. The results show that the decentralization within city model is the right model for DKI Jakarta, namely decentralizing institutional tasks to smaller units so that needs, responsibilities and decision making are closer to the community. This approach encourages the formation of a neighboring city government and a Mini-city Hall in the administrative city of Central Jakarta.*

**Keywords:** *Institutional Arrangement, City Administration, Government, DKI Jakarta.*

## **Introduction**

The institutional arrangement of DKI Jakarta cannot be separated from the division of government affairs, both general government affairs and concurrent affairs that must be carried out and accountable for its implementation by autonomous regions to the center which is the first element of regional government, after the clarity of government affairs according to regional authority, to carry out these affairs institutionalized. The source of the city's administrative authority comes from the DKI Jakarta province as the sole

recipient of authority to carry out government affairs from the center and is an inseparable part of the DKI Jakarta Province institution and status as a regional apparatus of the DKI Jakarta Province. The phenomenon related to the position of the service as a regional apparatus that carries out concurrent affairs will be closely related to the regional tasks carried out by the mayor/regent who is also the head of the regional apparatus in which there are sub-district heads and lurahs who have the working area of DKI Jakarta Province. Referring to the conclusion above, it is legally impossible to form an autonomous region at the sub-district level or in DKI Jakarta at the administrative city level because the existence of an administrative city/regency is a regional apparatus of a province. Most likely rationally that can be implemented is by delegating some of the authority and affairs or sub-government affairs to the mayor or administrative regent. This is in line with what is regulated in Law number 29 of 2007 article 26 paragraph (9) The Regional Government of DKI Jakarta Province delegates some of its authority and government affairs to the city/district administration, sub-district and village administrations in order to improve services to the community.

If we take a deeper critique regarding the position of the administrative city which is juridically as a regional apparatus for DKI Jakarta Province, it still causes serious debate, especially as seen from the preparation of the academic text on changes to the law on the capital which was carried out by the Election Advocacy Study Institute (LKAP) (2005) stating that the existence of A non-autonomous city/administrative district is an act that contradicts and is not in accordance with the provisions of Article 18 of the 1945 Constitution. However, if viewed from the characteristics of very fast urban development, it is still considered relevant, especially in the structure of urban areas which are developing very rapidly and the phenomenon tends to occur in urban areas. sprawl that requires space beyond the jurisdictional limits of each local government's jurisdiction. It is conceivable that if the city of DKI Jakarta is autonomous, then political fragmentation within the limited area of DKI Jakarta can certainly cause new problems that are increasingly complex because the handling of urban problems cannot be done partially but prioritizes the integration of regional-based programs. The problem of program integration in intervening in regional structuring is collided with regulations in the management of separate assets between each regional apparatus, especially the organizational arrangement of regional apparatus, one of which is based on government affairs in accordance with regional authority which has the potential for sector ego in the administration of government affairs. This condition is a serious concern, especially if it is related to the position of an administrative city that has the same characteristics and urban interests so that it is not politically fragmented so that the position of the city of DKI Jakarta is administrative as an apparatus of the DKI Jakarta province which is still felt to be relevant (Ramses & Bakry, 2010). Until now, the administrative city has not been delegated the authority to carry out a significant portion of government affairs which is dominated by the coordination function and makes it difficult to measure the accountability of the performance of the administrative mayor. This certainly has an impact on optimizing the performance and effectiveness of the administration of DKI Jakarta Province. Meanwhile, the task of the administrative city is to assist the governor in the administration of general government affairs, to coordinate the implementation of the tasks of the regional apparatus, to foster sub-districts and sub-districts and to carry out other tasks ordered by the governor. In other words, the administrative mayor's duties are only coordination and coaching.

In addition, Hankia & Downs (2010) also added that the position of mayor/regent can also be used as a semi-autonomous agency so that it has the authority to make decisions in overcoming certain problems and is a DKI Jakarta institution that is given the authority to manage certain problems, semi-autonomous city/district problems. To assist the implementation of these tasks, the Mayor/Regent is assisted by bureaucratic apparatus at the city/district level along with other needs (personnel, finance, infrastructure and so on). Another problem is related to the division of tasks and the working relationship between the Service, Sub-department and City administration/Administrative District. Referring to the DKI Jakarta Regional Regulation Number 5 of 2016 concerning the Formation and Organizational Structure of Regional Apparatuses, it is explained that the service tribe is an official work unit in the administrative city/administrative district. In other words, both the Service and the Service tribe carry out the same tasks/functions. Taking into account efficiency considerations and optimizing performance results, why do offices and sub-departments not share roles/functions where the Service is more directed to formulate technical policies and supervision-supervision (binwas) on government affairs being handled, while the service tribes are more directed as implementers of technical policies drawn up by the Service, so that neither the Service nor the sub-department are the same as implementers which can actually lead to the overlap that has been happening so far. Based on this phenomenon, the regional apparatus of DKI Jakarta administration in carrying out their duties and functions in accordance with the mandate of Law no. 23/2014, the concept of decentralization within cities carried out by the government becomes interesting to study in order to obtain a clear description and analysis of the existence of an administrative city territorial administration implementing unit in accordance with applicable laws and regulations. So, based on the explanation above, the problem that will be formulated by the author is to find an appropriate administrative city institutional arrangement model in the administration of the DKI Jakarta Province regional government.

## **Research Method**

### *Approaches and Types of Research*

This research uses qualitative research with analytical descriptive approach. Qualitative research intends to understand the phenomenon of what is experienced by the research subject holistically, and by way of description in the form of words and language, in a special natural context and by utilizing various scientific methods (Moleong, 2007).

### *Location Research*

The location of this research was carried out in DKI Jakarta Province, which became the object of this dissertation research was the institutional arrangement of city administration as a regional apparatus in DKI Jakarta Province. This is because the administrative city institution is the only administrative city institutional model as a regional apparatus for the DKI Jakarta Province which is not owned by other provincial regions, which include the administrative cities of South Jakarta, Central Jakarta and North Jakarta which have slightly different characteristics and tend to represent other administrative city characteristics.

### *Source and Types of Data*

The data sources of this research consist of primary data and secondary data. Primary data is data obtained directly from research subjects, both individuals and groups.

The statement is intended that researchers will obtain data or information directly by using pre-defined instruments. Primary data is specifically used by researchers to answer research questions. Sources of data from primary data include informants, data sourced from informants recorded through written notes or through video/audio tapes recording, taking photos or films; Events or incidents related to the arrangement of administrative city institutions as regional apparatus in the DKI Jakarta Province. While secondary data is data obtained by researchers through intermediary media. Secondary data consists of data in the form of evidence, records or historical reports that have been stored as archives or documentary data, both published and unpublished.

#### *Collecting and Analyze Data*

The data collection techniques used in this study as revealed by Kothari are interviews, documentation and field observations (Kothari, 2004) by combining the data collection techniques which will then be analyzed to the next stage. The data analysis process follows the Interactive data analysis model from Rashid (2005), namely the analysis is carried out continuously during data collection in the field until data collection is completed. This analysis includes several activities, namely reviewing data, grouping data, finding what is important according to the research focus and studying and deciding what to report. Thus the data analysis process runs simultaneously or continuously during the research process. For example, researchers collect data to collect documents on Laws, Permendagri, Regional Regulations, Governor Regulations related to the Implementation of City Administration Institutional Arrangements, to then sort them out and present their descriptions in research reports. This process is repeated for other data collection, according to what is in the research focus, so that all research problems can be answered.

### **Result and Discussion**

Based on the presentation of research results through observation, interviews and documentation, the findings show that institutionally the administrative city of Central Jakarta has not been able to agilely intervene in the problems that exist in the urban community of Central Jakarta which is increasingly complex and dynamic. In handling problems, the Mayor of the administration cannot deny the occurrence of functional intersections with elements of the Service and Sub-Department which in the end extends the span of control of the bureaucracy. The coordination function assigned to the Mayor is deemed insufficient to approach problems at the grassroots and its relation to strengthening local democracy, because after all the mayor does not seem to have a social contract to the public so that he has limitations in terms of output and performance outcomes. The New Public Service paradigm in the context of local government administration is manifested in institutionalized community participation. The NPM paradigms are considered a failure in part because they do not effectively accommodate citizen engagement. It is because of what is considered a failure in the NPM framework that in the last few decades there has been a lot of discussion about the call to provide a deeper space for democracy through the new role of public administrators, social accountability and transparency of information. This model is often referred to as the serving phase or what is familiarly known as the New Public Service (NPS) (J. Denhardt & Denhardt, 2003). This paradigm encourages the state to provide citizen-centric services within the framework of deliberative democracy that

allows citizens to play a more constructive role in monitoring and ensuring that minimum service standards are achieved (Gastil & Levine, 2005).

The main principles in the NPS model developed by Denhardt and Denhardt are constructed on seven interrelated ideas as follows (Silalahi & Syafri, 2015): 1. Serve citizens, not customers: citizens in public services are not just consumers. , but he is a citizen. The public interest is the result of a dialogue about shared values rather than the imposition of private interests or as formulated by politicians. Therefore, public servants do not merely respond to the wishes of consumers, but rather build relationships of mutual trust and collaboration with and among citizens; 2. Seek the Public Interest: Public administrators must contribute to building a collective sense of the common public interest. The goal is not to seek quick solutions initiated by individual choice. However, it is a creation of shared interests and shared responsibilities; 3. Value Citizenship over Entrepreneurship: The public interest is further promoted by public servants and citizens who are committed to making a meaningful contribution to society than entrepreneurial management who act as if public money is their own money. 4. Think Strategically, Act Democratically: Policies and programs that meet public needs can be achieved effectively and responsibly through collective efforts and collaborative processes; 5. Recognize that Accountability Is Not Simple: Public servants must carefully monitor not only the market, but also constitutional law, community values, political norms, professional standards, and citizens' interests. 6. Serve Rather Than Steer: It is increasingly important for public servants to use shared values-based leadership to help citizens articulate and fulfill their common interests rather than trying to control and steer society in new directions; 7. Value People, Not Just Productivity: Public organizations and networks in which they participate are more likely to succeed in the long term if they are operated through a process of collaboration and shared leadership based on respect for all.

Based on the results of the study, it was shown that the dynamics of the administration of local government in the Central Jakarta Administrative City showed interesting findings. This is inseparable from the Central Jakarta Administrative City institution which is under the autonomous command of the Governor as a regional apparatus so that it has limited authority in terms of intervention in public issues. Even though the problems in Central Jakarta are increasingly dynamic and complex, requiring an accountable and agile administrative city institutional pattern (Agile).

Based on intervention research on classic problems in DKI Jakarta, such as the arrangement of four market areas contained in the Regional Medium-Term Development Plan (RPJMD). Over time, this arrangement has not shown significant progress, due to budget constraints and bureaucratic factors that have not been completely free from sectoral egos. The mayor of Central Jakarta administration actually has the capacity and capability to optimize resources for the achievement of the program. However, the handling of this program has involved many actors and various sectors which are actually encouraged to synergize and collaborate. But the reality shows that these actors are still stuck in the routine of coordination only.

The dynamics of the institutional existence of the Central Jakarta Administrative City can also be discussed in the context of institutional isomorphism, especially if it is associated with the fact that public sector institutions always accept new regulations both in the context of local government and also from the central government. Therefore,

government institutions are always encouraged to adapt to changes in structure, routines and habits (Muluk & Danar, 2021).

In its journey, the Central Jakarta Administrative City has always carried out good development programs that involve many and diverse layers of actors, so that many programs appear to be successful on the surface but do not actually reflect the actual development situation. There is a kind of capability traps, namely high expectations that accompany development programs driven by a good governance approach that ends in neglecting the capacity of the government system to implement them. This reality is relevant to the term isomorphic mimicry, namely how organizations make assumptions that appear superior but are only cosmetic and temporary.

From an empirical perspective, based on the results of the case study, the regional arrangement that is listed on the Mayor's performance tends to be in place. This is because the Mayor does not have sufficient ammunition of authority to intervene in the program. Resources are fragmented bureaucratically by sector so that the budget and other resources cannot be optimally located in the City Secretariat, Central Jakarta administration. In the end, the Secretariat of the Central Jakarta City Administration was not able to agilely execute these prestigious programs.

On the other hand, Pritchett et al (2013) actually see isomorphic mimicry in a positive light as an effort to strengthen administrative capabilities within the scope of public sector institutional arrangements. This approach was adopted by the bureaucratic institutional structure as a camouflage to cover the limitations of the institutional function. However, in the end, the continuous application of isomorphic mimicry can increase the burden in the form of a 'capability trap' and in the long run will lead to the failure of the implementation of a government program. This is a concern as well as motivation so that City Administration institutions can transform into responsive, adaptive and collaborative institutions with the main key in strengthening capacity to increase capability, namely in the form of delegation of greater authority to intervene in a public problem.

In the course of the dynamics of administrative city governance, it is relevant to the decentralization within city model, namely decentralizing institutional tasks to smaller units so that needs, responsibilities and decision making are closer to the community (Norton, 1994). In terms of public participation in the United States, decentralization within cities is manifested in the form of neighboring government and Mini-city Hall. This model can also be traced in England which they call neighborhood decentralization.

In an urban environment as a result of decentralization policies, the formation of urban sub-administrations as representative advisory units has been accepted in European countries with the aim of articulating the needs of their environment while bringing power closer to the people and attracting more participants into the political system (Norton, 1994). Several countries have given authority to the sub-units of urban administration to carry out and budget for managing work towards a general pattern of decentralization of functions throughout the new area based on the principle of subsidiarity or the formation of branches called decentralization within the city.

In addition, local administrative centers were established in a number of cities, especially in New York and Philadelphia to encourage constructive initiatives by voluntary groups to develop into self-administration levels, but success has been limited. Likewise in the UK some cities have decentralized administration to local sub-urban offices which

are expected to form close consultative arrangements with local residents but this is also still considered to have no significant impact, except for a few cases (Norton, 1994).

The above description is in line with the opinion of Muluk (2009) which explains that Decentralization within the City is a form of public participation in the US, which is manifested in the form of neighboring government and mini city halls which are practiced in the US in thousands of administrative areas. sparsely populated. The federal government has supported its existence to stimulate self-help in large cities since 1961, by financing this self-help and supporting maximum participation of the poor. Small town halls and neighborhood service centers were opened with the hope of building community corporations selected from volunteer action groups to advise local government officials and initiate self-help. Its functions include monitoring of services and preparation of regional development programs, compliance with capital and revenue budget priorities, participation and project planning and discussion, discussion of plan applications, assistance in the preparation of service reports by local government agencies, processing of citizen complaints and demands, dissemination information on local government services and programs. Service boundaries are sought as far as practicable and do not overlap with any district except the school district. However, the results are often disappointing as it requires priority to achieve fragmented administrative coordination.

Based on Muluk's explanation above, it can be seen that decentralization in the city requires community participation through institutions formed by the government to increase the potential for self-reliance and participation of the poor or marginalized such as RT, RW, Kelurahan Deliberative Institutions and City Councils which are directly elected by the community or community. in the administrative city area of Central Jakarta. The community institutions are regulated based on the Regulation in article 6 (1) of the Minister of Home Affairs Number 18 of 2018, Types of Village Community Institutions at least include a. Neighborhood Association b. Pillars of Citizens c. Empowerment of Family Welfare, d. Youth Organization e. Integrated Service Post, and f. Community Empowerment Institutions and the Act, namely Law Number 29 of 2007 article 24 (1) To assist the mayor/regent in administering the city/district government, a City/Regency Council is formed, article 26 (1) To assist the lurah in administering the kelurahan government in form of village council.

The decentralization within city approach in the context of governance in the administrative city of Central Jakarta can be described clearly. Based on the results of the study, it is illustrated where the role of grassroots elements in the administrative city institutional hierarchy, from the sub-district, village, RT and RW and so on is moving massively in terms of participating and being the front line in handling the covid-19 pandemic. In addition, the existence of the city council as an element of control over the city administration also plays good social and political control for strengthening local democracy in the Central Jakarta Administrative City.

Meanwhile, the mini city hall is run by village, sub-district and city administration officials to receive input and to facilitate community participation in the planning, program implementation and budgeting processes as well as development information. The idea of decentralization in cities with the formation of branches (subsidiarities) through sub-urbans is in line with the basic idea of the importance of decentralization by Cheema and Rondinelli (1983), namely: By decentralizing functions and reassigning central government officials to local level, these officials knowledge of and sensitivity to local

problems and need can be increased. Closer contact between government official and the local population would allow both to obtain better information with which to formulate more realistic and effective plans for government projects and programs.

If one observes the concept of decentralization within the city above, the formation of sub-urban branches is closer to management decentralization in the form of deconcentration (Burn, et al, 1994). Thus, decentralization within the city is related to the formation of administrative cities that adhere to single autonomy or one-level regional government, the administrative city institutional model adheres to the efficiency structural model with the delegation of authority which is *ultra vires* doctrine, namely the authority that is delegated to carry out certain affairs or actions or provide certain services. course (Muluk, 2009) which aims to ensure the creation of efficiency and economy, especially for uniformity and conformity (Hoessein 2011). In addition, the Structural efficiency model approach aims to increase the efficiency and effectiveness of government administration (Prasojo et al., 2006).

In decentralization within a city, the formation of an administrative sub-urban is a consequence of the application of the principle of deconcentration, namely the transfer of a number of administrative authorities and responsibilities to lower branches of government departments or agencies (Rondinelli, Nellis and Cheema (1983) which has dimensions (1) delegation of authority (2) decision-making, finance and management functions (3) different levels of government and (4) within the central jurisdiction (decentralization within the city). This deconcentration gave birth to field administration or administrative areas (Prasojo et al., 2006).

The administrative area is a decentralized environment within the city (decentralization within the city), as a consequence of the decentralization policy the formation of territorial sub-divisions of a country that has a measure of autonomy and self-governing through political institutions that have roots in the region in accordance with their jurisdictional boundaries and these institutions are recruited democratically (Muluk, 2009). Therefore, the decentralization policy requires area restrictions based on the spatial pattern of social and economic life, a sense of political identity and the efficiency of public services that can be implemented and decentralization includes the delegation of authority, both political and bureaucratic authorities (Smith, 2012).

The existence of an administrative unit that has a deconcentration pattern within the scope of decentralization within the city, it is possible for the administrative city to get the delegation of authority to carry out some government affairs within the scope of its work area to improve the quality of service for its citizens. Within the scope of the administrative city, there are lower community organizations that are formed voluntarily which are initiated and determined by the government as part of the local sub-government to strengthen community participation through a neighboring organization as a form of the penetration system approach (penetrated system approach) (Ruland, 1988). In relation to decentralization within the city, the decentralization thought conveyed by Burns, et al (1994) said that the formation of an administrative unit that has a regional basis can be strengthened in its role by being given greater authority, not only the authority to coordinate and consult in relation to with general government duties but the authority to carry out several affairs that are carried out in an integrated manner in a complete plan to improve the quality of services for city residents, meaning that the given authority is one of the strengthening of the administrative unit organization in making decisions related to



services provided in accordance with its jurisdictional limits. . City administration is a form of decentralization within a city in the form of deconcentration which produces field administration which has 3 (three) important aspects that are different from devolution, namely the form of authority given to field officers is more bureaucratic than political, the two regional administrators are usually civil servants. civilian recruited normal selection and third areas where field officers are limited by the administrative requirements of the functions performed (Smith, 2012).

To increase the participation of the community, the mayor is assisted by the city council which is a deliberation institution at the city/district level for community participation in the implementation of development and improvement of community services. The city council is elected by the DPRD based on elections held at the kelurahan level. Meanwhile, at the kelurahan level, a kelurahan deliberation institution was formed that functions to accommodate aspirations and increase community participation and empowerment, which is the practice of neighborhood decentralization presented by Burn et al., (1994) namely: “By empowering we mean enhancing the degree of decision making authority. By neighborhoods we refer to sub areas within the geographical area of the authority. these could, in practice , be small districts within a city or village/small towns within a country”.

The existence of the city council and deliberative institutions is a forum for the community to participate and at the same time convey the aspirations of the community towards the service needs that must be met by the Special Capital Region of Jakarta while making mayors, sub-districts and lurahs more responsive and accountable to the demands of the community. In addition, the concept of institutional dynamics is also an important reference to consider in transforming functions into institutional models as a result of adaptation to the development of urban community demands, so that it will be clear that institutional arrangements depart from the diffusion of innovations or based on institutional historical experience. Environmental aspects and institutional dynamics will form a more responsive and accountable model of administrative city institutional arrangement.

## **Conclusion**

Based on the presentation of research results through observation, interviews and documentation, the findings show that institutionally the administrative city of Central Jakarta has not been able to agilely intervene in the problems that exist in the urban community of Central Jakarta which is increasingly complex and dynamic. In handling problems, the Mayor of the administration cannot deny the occurrence of functional intersections with elements of the Service and Sub-Department which in the end extends the span of control of the bureaucracy. The coordination function assigned to the Mayor is deemed insufficient to approach problems at the grassroots and its relation to strengthening local democracy, because after all the mayor does not seem to have a social contract to the public so that he has limitations in terms of output and performance outcomes. In its journey, the dynamics of administrative city governance are in line with the decentralization within city model, namely decentralizing institutional tasks to smaller units so that needs, responsibilities and decision making are closer to the community. This approach encourages the formation of a neighboring city government and a Mini-city Hall in the administrative city of Central Jakarta. This model can also be traced in England

which they call neighborhood decentralization. Therefore, in order for the Central Jakarta Administrative City to transform into agile, it is important to establish urban sub-administration as a representative advisory unit at the grassroots level. It aims to bring power closer to the people and attract more participants into the political system. Several countries have given authority to the sub-units of urban administration to carry out and budget for managing work towards a general pattern of decentralization of functions throughout the new area based on the principle of subsidiarity or the formation of branches called decentralization within the city.

## References

1. Cheema, G. S. and Rondinelli, D.A. (2007). Decentralizing Governance, Emerging Concepts and Practices. Part I: From Government
2. Denhardt, J., & Denhardt, R. (2003). The New Public Service: Serving, Not Steering, M.E Sharpe.
3. Gastil, J., & Levine, P. (2005). The Deliberative Democracy Handbook: Strategies for Effective Civic Engagement in the Twenty-First Century. Jossey-Bass.
4. Hankla, C. & Downs, D. (2010) Decentralisation, Governance and the Structure of Local Political Institutions: Lessons for Reform? *Local Government Studies*, 36:6, 759-783, DOI: 10.1080/03003930.2010.522079
5. Hoessein, B. (2011). Perubahan Model, Pola dan Bentuk Pemerintahan Daerah: Dari Era Orde Baru ke Era Reformasi, Departemen Ilmu Administrasi Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Indonesia.
6. Kothari. (2004). Research Methodology. Methods and Techniques. New Delhi: New Age International (P), Ltd.
7. Moleong, L. J. (2007). Penelitian Penelitian Kualitatif, Bandung; Remaja Rosdakarya.
8. Muluk, K. M. R (2009). Peta Konsep Desentralisasi dan Pemerintahan Daerah, ITS Press Surabaya.
9. Muluk, K & Danar, O. (2021). Policy-Practice Decoupling in Institutionalizing Performance Accountability of Local Government: Case Study of Malang City, Indonesia. *Local Administration Journal* 14(2) • April – June 2021.
10. Norton, A. (1994), International Handbook of Local and Regional Government, A Comparative Analysis of Advanced Democracies., UK.
11. Prasajo, E. et al. (2006). Desentralisasi dan Pemerintahan Daerah : Antara Model Demokrasi Lokal dan Efisiensi Struktural, Departemen Ilmu Administrasi, Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Indonesia.
12. Pritchett, L. (2013). Looking Like a State: Techniques of Persistent Failure in State Capability for Implementation. Working Papers. *Journal of Development Studies*.
13. Ramses, A. & Bakry, L. (2010). Pemerintahan Daerah di Indonesia. Jakarta. MIPI.
14. Rashid, A. (2005). The Politics of Administrative Decentralization in Bangladesh, *Canadian Journal of Development Studies / Revue canadienne d'études du développement*, 26:4, 781-798, DOI: 10.1080/02255189.2005.9669086
15. Rondinelli, D. A. and Cheema, G.S. (1983). Decentralization and Development: Policy Implementation in Developing Countries. California: SAGE Publication Inc.
16. Ruland, J. (1988). Urban Government and Development in Asia, Munchen, Wlforum Verlag.
17. Silalahi, U., & Syafri, W. (2015). Desentralisasi Dan Demokrasi Pelayanan Publik Menuju Pelayanan Pemerintah Daerah Lebih Transparan, Partisipatif, Responsif dan Akuntabel. *Journal of Chemical Information and Modeling*, 53(9).
18. Smith, B. C. (2012). Decentralization: The Territorial Dimension of the State. Jakarta: Masyarakat Ilmu Pemerintahan Indonesia.



This article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution - Non Commercial - No Derivatives 4.0 International License.