

# Decentralization Autonomic Areas of Islands Characteristic

Petrus Polyando<sup>1</sup>; Mudiayati Rahmatunnisa<sup>2</sup>; Budhi Gunawan<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Doctoral Candidate at Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Padjadjaran

<sup>2 & 3</sup>senior lecturer at Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Padjadjaran

**Abstract:-** This study seeks to find and identify the factors that led to decentralization in autonomous regions characterized by islands that have not improved the welfare of their communities and developed an understanding of criteria that need to be considered in decentralization policies in the area. The research findings reveal that the policy approach factor in the delegation of authority has not specifically considered the uniqueness and plurality criteria of autonomous regions that are characterized by islands so that the main causes of the implementation of decentralization have not improved the welfare of their communities. Such behavior is also due to the lack of full support from aspects of Environmental Conditions, Government Organizations, Resources for program implementation and Characteristics of Implementing Institutions.

**Keywords:-** Decentralization, Autonomic.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Democratic movements in various countries have an impact on the trend of paradigm shift in governance from centripetal to centrifuges (Prasojo, 2009), from one centralized system to spread (decentralization) (Shah, 1998 in Alisjahbana, 1999: 2). The results of the study show that about 95 percent of current democracies, both large and small, rich and poor, have chosen to surrender political, fiscal and administrative power to the level of subnational government (Katorobo, 2004). The global trend towards decentralization has transferred authority, responsibility and resources to public functions from the central government to local governments (Mawhood, 1983; Smith, 1985; Bennett, 1997; Rondinelli, 1999: 2; Agrawal and Ribot, 1999; Oxhorn, et al., 2004; Ahmad & Brosio, 2006; Bardhan & Mookherjee, 2006; Keating & McEwen, 2006).

In connection with that, decentralization is then accepted as something that is absolutely unavoidable. The public claims that decentralization is a solution to the problem of the realization of governance to be more effective, more solutive and democratic (Olowu, 2003, quoted by Hoover, 2006: 57). Decentralization is considered a key component in good governance and development (White, 2011: 1). This not only applies in developed countries, but also becomes the focus of attention on the agenda of changes in governance in developing countries (JLGG Newsletter, 1999). Experience in various countries shows the positive impact of decentralization on development performance (Einar, 2008;

Sverrisson, 2001; Mick & James, 1999). This behavior then raises a general affirmation that decentralization is an absolute necessity or necessity in the administration of government. These needs target all countries and even small countries have regional governments with a certain degree of autonomy (King, 1982; Duehacek, 1970, quoted by MIPI, 2012).

With regard to the implementation of regional autonomy which has not been successful in regions in several countries, it appears from uneven regional development, thus expanding the gap between regions (Montero & David, 2004). Regional disparities occur where some local governments cannot overcome imbalances and local problems that disrupt trust in the commitment of national government (Prud'homme, 1995: 202-203). The inability of local governments in the development affects the level of welfare of the local community. Concretely is the high level of poverty among residents of the local community and unfair differences in income distribution. This phenomenon of inequality is a logical consequence of development orientation in the era of regional autonomy which tends to lead to the allocation of resources found in growth areas (Tjokrowinoto, 1999). This condition is strengthened again by the fact that there are variations in regional characteristics with differences in the potential of each region's resources and differences in the quality of human resources in various regions (Pose, et. Al, 2007).

The problem of decentralization is also related to natural resource management, where weaknesses in the implementation of decentralization lead to deviations in natural resource management (Nurkin, 2006). Decentralization in the context of development also raises issues of inequality regarding policies that are made in a uniform pattern and do not accommodate regional diversity. Subnational governments in developing countries often lack the ability to design, build and operate infrastructure, even though they have the potential and capacity of the skills needed efficiently and effectively. These problems are often encountered due to the generalization of decentralization policies that pay little attention to variations in regional conditions in most developing countries (Prud'homme, 1995). The issue of inequality in development outcomes creates a sense of injustice that has the potential to give birth to demands and movements in various regions that threaten the disintegration of the state (Hendratno, 2007). This then led to dissatisfaction with the decentralization process which had not protected the region and also had not provided benefits for the progress of the region. Existing

decentralization is considered not to empower and even weaken certain groups (Töpperwien, 2010).

The problem of regional autonomy is also enlivened by issues regarding ethnic, cultural and historical differences and even different languages, which result in a different social system between one region and another so that a decentralized system of government is needed differently in a country (Smith, 1985). In this context, it is also focused on the geographical differences that have led to the development gap between the mainland and the archipelago. That countries that have diverse groups, especially territorially concentrated ones, need to find ways to work together in providing public services effectively (Bird, 2003). The facts of economic, demographic and social diversity, which are reflected in many government structures such as political jurisdiction and the characteristics of government households in a country, cannot be treated in the form of decentralization in one measure for all. With different instruments it is more likely to have different effects in certain circumstances, so different approaches are needed to achieve acceptable results.

This study aims to find out the causes of decentralization in Indonesia yet to prosper the people in the regions characterized by islands. This is because Indonesia is one of the countries that has implemented large-scale decentralization (big bang decentralization). However, various policies in decentralization and their implementation have not prospered the people in the area. Inequality can still be seen from the achievements of human development through the Human Development Index (HDI). The facts of HDI development in areas outside Java with island characteristics are still lagging behind other regions and below the national HDI average.

## II. DISCUSSION

### A. *Conditions of the Socio-Political Environment in the Formulation of Decentralization Policies*

The dimensions of the socio-political environment are related to aspects of the condition of the national political structure, the process of policy formulation, and the involvement of local social groups in the policies of decentralization and regional autonomy. That the decentralization policy that has been established essentially arises from a special and complex condition of the socio-political environment. Collaboration on the support of the three aspects above determines the birth of a decentralization policy that accommodates all interests. As reflected in the ideas of Rondinelli and Cheema (1983: 32), that the national political structure, ideology, and policy formulation processes influence the level and direction of the implementation of regional autonomy. In addition, the characteristics of local structures, socio-cultural groups involved in policy formulation, and infrastructure conditions also play an important role in the implementation of regional autonomy. Thus the decentralization policy in autonomous regions characterized by islands should be accommodated from the

policy formulation process which takes into account the three aspects above.

In connection with the condition of the autonomous region characterized by the islands, the implications of the decentralization policy for this region can be seen from the regional government law issued. Specific on the consideration and content of the material contained in the Act. To find out more about each of the aspects above, interview data and documentation studies can be an elaboration material on the condition of the socio-political environment in the formulation of decentralization policies.

The national political structure includes political superstructure and political infrastructure. Political superstructure with regard to the support of the government and the DPR in the transfer of authority to the regions through the law produced. The context concerns the attention of the government and the DPR in considering areas characterized by islands. Meanwhile, political infrastructure deals with the demands and support of community organizations, especially the local social groups who want decentralization. Related to this matter can be seen from the regional government law that has been issued, of which 3 (three) local government laws have been issued, each of which has a variety of considerations regarding regulatory funds regarding the transfer of authority to regions including autonomous regions with island characteristics.

In Law Number 22 Year 1999, it shows the considerations and material content of the arrangement for the transfer of authority to focus on the government to hand over the affairs and regions to implement it. The government and the House of Representatives agreed to only stipulate the authority that was handed over and which was not handed over to the regions. The political nuances of the Government and the House of Representatives are very dominant in their attention to the demands of the community to move from centralization to decentralization. The demands of the community at that time also seemed not specific to the surrender of authority based on the geographical considerations of the islands. This is seen from the document data contained in the government statement text on the draft law on regional government. Furthermore, in Law No. 32 of 2004, several key considerations were made by the government and the DPR before the revision, among others, empirical facts regarding the existence of several problems which, if left unchecked, would disrupt the effectiveness of regional government administration. With regard to Law No. 23 of 2014, the process dynamics of the superstructure and infrastructure are reflected in the considerations discussed between the government and the DPR as well as the demands submitted by community organizations along with the need for changes in the transfer of authority to autonomous regions.

Policy formulation process; The formulation of a decentralization policy that was realized through the regional government law, each of them has its own variations. In Law Number 22 of 1999, the process of

formulating policies at that time accommodated the mandate of reform which demanded a paradigm shift in government, from being centralized to decentralized, prioritizing the principles of democracy, equity and justice, paying attention to differences and diversity, and preventing national disintegration (Gadjong, 2011). In terms of time, this law was issued 1 (one) year after the 1998 reform.

Next is the process of formulating Law Number 32 of 2004. This law is issued with reference to the dynamics of consideration due to social changes. In its development, then Law Number 32 of 2004 was changed to Law Number 23 of 2014. The process of formulating this Law has been different from before where it has gone through several stages that refer to the provisions concerning the establishment of legislation (Law Number 12 of 2011).

Thus, the description of the process of formulating decentralization policies based on all these laws, it appears that there is a very fast duration which is quite long and through several drafting mechanisms. The dynamics of this formulation follow the development of demands and developing social changes in order to produce better decentralization. However, the process of formulating this policy has not accommodated overall several interest groups including regions characterized by islands.

Involvement of local community social groups in decentralization and regional autonomy policies; This aspect concerns the involvement of local communities, especially islands, in the formulation of decentralization policies. This can be seen from the expressed aspirations and the proposed consideration of the islands to get special attention in the decentralization policy. Related to this matter can be drawn from the regional government law. In Law 22 of 1999, the involvement of local social groups, especially islands, to fight for their rights and needs, has not yet emerged specifically. Likewise, the case with Law number 32 of 2004, where the basis of consideration and list of inverted problems has not been found specific demands to consider the condition of the islands. Furthermore, in Law No. 23 of 2014, the issue of island areas has been raised which accommodates proposals from the Provincial Islands Cooperation Agency in 2009. Here it is seen that the involvement of community social groups in the formulation of decentralization policies, especially the island communities, emerged in the formulation of Law No. 23 of 2014. The community proposals were accommodated in discussions between the government and the DPR so that they were included in Law number 23 of 2014.

#### *B. Submission of Government Affairs*

The parameters of the surrender of authority to the regions carry out government affairs, with regard to the criteria used in determining an area to obtain authority. These criteria have been determined as part of the policies contained in the regional government law and have colored the implementation of decentralization. Each Law has different treatment in the transfer of authority to

autonomous regions, including autonomous regions, characterized by islands. In Law Number 22 Year 1999, general construction is used, namely the government delegates authority to autonomous regions to carry out all matters other than those owned by the center. This means that the center delegates the authority of the government to the regions to carry out authority based on their own needs and initiatives beyond the authority of the center. This concept in general understanding is known as General Competence construction "(Nurcholis, 2007: 155-156; Ferazi, 2008: 25-26). This model of surrender of authority applies generally to all regions, where there is no special treatment in certain regions based on certain categories.

The same model continued during the period of Law No. 32 of 2004, however, at this time functional assignments were carried out based on more specific criteria. The submission criteria for government affairs are the criteria for externalities, accountability, and efficiency by taking into account the harmony of relations between government structures. Determination of the criteria for delegating authority to autonomous regions to carry out government affairs is also continued on Law Number 23 of 2014 which at this time was added to the criteria of national strategic interests. All of these criteria then gave birth to the stipulation of Government Affairs under the authority of the Central Government, provincial and district / city regions. With the existing criteria, it appears that government affairs that are left to the regions generally apply to both the island and non-island areas. This means that all regions get authority that is not much different from these criteria. It can be simplified that the implementation of the transfer of authority based on existing criteria has not impacted on the birth of the specification of treatment in the island region.

Submission of authority with existing criteria results in the division of functions that tend to be the same so that it ignores the fact that the diversity of objects managed by each region. This behavior is coupled with the support of resources that follow the administration of government functions, which apply in the same format. This means that all regions receive resource support based on existing authorities. If the authority submitted is likely to be the same, the support of the resources will follow the same thing from the authority. It can be simplified that the authority submission parameters that have not paid attention to the capacity of autonomous regions characterized by islands are one of the important dimensions of the causes of inequality in achieving development outcomes for the welfare of their communities.

#### *C. Model of Government Organizations in Autonomous Regions Characteristic of Islands*

In this context government organizations are formed based on service needs to communities everywhere including island communities. As the main instrument for implementing regional government, the position of regional government organizations has a very strategic role, among others: (1) As a forum and framework for regional financial

systems, regional staffing systems, regional planning systems, public service systems and various systems or sub-systems others; (2) As a means of regional government to carry out various authorities or government affairs; (3) As a forum for regional governments to realize regional visions and missions, regional goals, and carry out public services that are the duties and responsibilities of local governments (Solomon, 2006). For this reason, the suitability of governmental organizations with task objects is an important aspect in realizing regional development management that is prosperous to the people. Specific about the appropriate organizational design model to support the effectiveness of governance and regional development characterized by islands.

The model of government organizations that exist in autonomous regions characterized by islands during the decentralization period generally refers to the central provisions which are nationally used as references. Regions have not yet formed an organization that fits the needs and characteristics of the region. Although in the provisions concerning the guideline for organization of regional apparatus, space has been provided for regions to form regional organizations to consider authority, characteristics, potential and needs, financial capacity, availability of apparatus resources, and development of cooperation patterns between regions and / or with third parties. In this case, there has been a discretion of the Regions to determine the needs of the organization in accordance with the assessment of each region.

The model of regional apparatus organizations that exist in the islands has not fully accommodated the needs of implementing government functions according to regional characteristics. With the condition of the existing regional apparatus organization, it has not reached the implementation of functions that should have been carried out. In terms of specific structure and function design, there has not been any concern for the characteristics and needs of the region, so that this condition affects the development and implementation of government administration in the islands. This is very closely related because the regional apparatus organization as the organizer of government affairs in the regions is given a crucial role accompanied by resources. With the model of regional government organizations that do not properly accommodate the needs of autonomous regions characterized by islands, the vision and mission of regional development, regional objectives, and public services are not realized. As a result, the community does not get the development impact on achieving their welfare.

#### *D. Uniqueness of Islands Regional Identity*

Autonomous regions characterized by islands are in fact made up of clusters of islands formed because of the similarity or closeness of both the geographical and the relations of the people who inhabit them. The inhabited and uninhabited islands are the jurisdiction of an autonomous region. As for the condition of each inhabited and uninhabited island varies, there is a region that is quite extensive and there is a very small area. In connection with

this geographical condition, in addition to exposure to inhabited islands there are also islands that are not inhabited and become part of the jurisdiction of the work area that must be considered by the region.

The archipelago with some indications of its particularity is one of the dimensions that causes the development of island areas not yet fulfilling the basic needs of the community to achieve their welfare. These uniqueness has not been managed properly through adequate resources support so that it is still part of regional development constraints. With the uniqueness that exists, the process of implementing government functions on the islands cannot be carried out in full from all aspects of the basic needs of the community even though some areas have not been able to be reached with basic services from the local government. This was revealed that the uniqueness of the island area was one of the causes of the implementation of the full function of the government which had not been carried out through the current model of handover of authority, so that it had not yet achieved the welfare of its people.

#### *E. Management of Economic Resources*

The challenge in terms of economic management of island areas is the economic resource base that has not been managed in a focus from the existing potential. Often regions are caught up in diverse management of resources but do not prioritize which ones are potentially prioritized and which ones are supporting. Some commodity values from various sectors that are less productive from year to year are always forced into superior commodities. Meanwhile other potential resources in the archipelago have not been excavated and developed as primary commodity values.

From the data on economic resource potential, it can be seen that the island area has a lot of potential that is spread widely on each island, but the management and development orientation is still dominated by the primary sector as a main contributor to the local economy. Regions prioritize traditional sectors that are attached to the community in regional economic development. Meanwhile other sectors which are also very potential in the island area have not been managed and are used as a mainstay of the local economy's carrying capacity. Even though the other sectors recorded as potential sectors are spread across the islands and quite varied. The tendency of regions to focus on the primary sector makes existing programs and policies lead to certain sectors even though their productivity is decreasing or decreasing from year to year. It is this that does not provide significant progress for the value added of the welfare of the islands.

The management of the economic potential of islands is a problem that has caused this region to not improve its welfare despite decentralization policies. The development orientation which still focuses on the primary sector and has not made a breakthrough in innovation in the development of other potential sectors has an impact on the income earned by the region. Regional dependence on the

primary sector alone so that the value of regional revenues has not increased rapidly to boost the structure of the regional budget. Meanwhile, to make changes in meeting development needs, especially the basic needs of the community requires a large amount of money. This fact of gaps is faced by the regions in carrying out government functions in the islands.

#### *F. External Relations between Autonomous Regions and Supranational Institutions (Provinces and Centers)*

The dimensions of relations between autonomous regions and supranational institutions are important to highlight, given the pattern of relations in the decentralization policy that has resulted in several forms including deconcentration and co-administration tasks. This relates to the ability of the implementers in the field of technical, managerial and political skills in the archipelago in planning, coordinating, controlling and integrating each decision, whether coming from organizational sub-units, as well as support coming from provinces and other central government institutions. In addition, the nature and quality of internal communication, the relationship between the regional apparatus and the community, and the effective relationship with the private sector and non-governmental organizations play an important role in the implementation of regional autonomy. The same important thing regarding this aspect is quality leadership, and staff commitment to policy objectives (Rondinelli and Cheema, 1983: 32).

In terms of deconcentration, it is seen that relations are built indirectly with the islands because they only involve the central government and the governor as representatives of the central government. However, the island region has the effect of a deconcentrated policy from the proposals submitted by the governor. This means that the administration of government affairs in the islands can be supported by programs from the ministry through deconcentration principles, when the provincial government brings proposals for the needs of the island region. The opposite happens where the island region does not get the proper program when relevant programs are not needed as needed. Even due to the demands of procedures and mechanisms of ministries that handle affairs so often ignore regional needs. The impact on the program implemented is not in accordance with what is needed in the island community. Thus, the pattern of relations between islands and the government from this deconcentration principle, has not contributed to regional development. The implementation of several programs from the government through the relevant ministry institutions, has not met the needs of the islands.

With regard to the implementation of the co-administration principle as another form of regional relations pattern with the central government and the provincial government, it was found that the central government and the provincial government had assigned several programs to the regions to carry out government affairs which were central and provincial authorities. However, the programs that departed from the proposals of the regions often did not synchronize with regional needs,

both in terms of the budget and the proposed field of affairs. The data shows several areas of affairs that should be prioritized in the development of islands and are the responsibility of the central government and the provincial government, but have not yet been implemented. Some informants stated that some of the basic needs of the island community are still neglected, even though in principle the authority of the central government and the provincial government is under the authority. With the condition of the area which was left to drag on, thus inhibiting the activities of the community in the islands. This is very ironic because the problems in the islands which should have been able to be resolved by the region itself, but because it is not the authority so that the problem is left.

External relations between island autonomous regions and supranational institutions (provincial and central) contributing to the causes of decentralization in island areas have not improved the welfare of their communities. Relations that are built through deconcentration and co-administration tasks have not become complementary which complements the existing implementation needs of decentralization. The development programs and activities carried out on the basis of these two patterns of relations have not been able to fill the gap in meeting the basic needs of the people of the islands.

### **III. CONCLUSION**

This study identifies several factors that have caused decentralization not to prosper the people in autonomous regions with island characteristics. In general, the existing decentralization policies have not considered the diversity of geographical characteristics of the regions so they tend to be the same and generalized to all regions. As a result, some of the needs of autonomous regions characterized by islands were not accommodated and were not accommodated in the decentralization policy in question. Furthermore, in its implementation, the resources in the autonomous region with characteristic islands have not yet been supported as well as the activities of organizing government functions on each island. This has an impact on the basic needs of the community that has not been met evenly from various sectors. The success of decentralization in autonomous regions characterized by islands must be accompanied by changes in the criteria for transfer of authority that accommodate geographical conditions and plurality of regions.

### **RECOMMENDATIONS**

Addition of specific criteria in the transfer of authority as a complement to the general criteria that have been set. It is emphasized by the new perspective that the island area is a regency / city area that has an archipelagic characteristic, therefore the policy of the island area is focused specifically on the area in question rather than on the provinces which are characterized by islands. The archipelago is emphasized the authority to manage its territory specifically, where the status of authority in an object of government affairs which has so far been part of

the upper level of government needs to be transferred to the responsibility of the island region. Provided the freedom of the islands to form local government organizations according to the characteristics of the region by developing a model for strengthening regional agencies to serve the people on the islands. The policy of managing economic resources in the islands needs to be left entirely to the regions so that the focus of management is not only in the primary sector but also in the secondary sector and tertiary sector.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Agrawal, A. and Ribot, J. 1999. "Accountability in Decentralization: A Framework with South Asian and West African Cases", the Journal of Developing Areas 33, 4: 473-502.
- [2]. Ahmad, E. and Brosio, G. (eds).,2006. Handbook of Fiscal Federalism. Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
- [3]. Alisjahbana, Armida S., 1999, "Otonomi Daerah dan Perimbangan Keuangan antara Pemerintah Pusat dan Daerah", Makalah disampaikan pada Seminar Nasional Platform untuk Masa Depan Ekonomi Indonesia, Bandung
- [4]. Analisis Filosofis Pemerintahan Daerah Dalam Pergantian (Perubahan) Kaidah Hukum Dasar Negara, Agusssalim Andi Gadjong, Jurnal Hukum dan Pembangunan Tahun ke-41 No. I Januari-Maret 2011
- [5]. Bardhan, P. and Mookherjee, D. (eds).,2006. Decentralization and Local Governance in Developing Countries. London: MIT Press.
- [6]. Barankay, I. and B. Lockwood. 2007. Decentralization and the Productive Efficiency of Government: Evidence from Swiss Cantons. Journal of Public Economics. 91 (5–6). pp. 1197–1218.
- [7]. Bennett, R. J. 1997. 'Administrative system and economic space', Regional Studies, 31(3): 323336
- [8]. Bird, Richard M. & Robert D. Ebel., 2005, Fiscal Federalism and National Unity Brilantes Jr., Decentralization Imperatives, Lessons from Some Asian Countries, Journal of International Cooperation Studies, Vo.12 No.1, August 2004, h.39.
- [9]. Diaz-Serrano, L. and A. Rodríguez-Pose, 2011, Decentralisation, happiness and the perception of institutions", SERC Discussion Paper. London: Spatial Economics Research Centre.
- [10]. Einar Braathen., 2008, Decentralisation and Poverty Reduction, A Review of the Linkages in Tanzania and the International Literature, Norad Report 22b/2008 Discussion, Norwegian Agency for Development Cooperation, <http://www.norad.no/items/14184/38/2084279701/Decentralisation>;
- [11]. Fiszbein, A. 1997. The Emergence of Local Capacity: Lessons from Colombia. World Development. 25 (7). pp. 1029–1043.
- [12]. Ghoshal, Baladas.,2004."Democratic Transition and Political Development in Post-Soeharto Indonesia", dalam : Contemporary Southeast Asia. Vol. 26. No. 3, pp. 506-529.
- [13]. Hendratno, E.,T., 2007., Desentralisasi yang Mengarah ke Sistem Federal dan Pengaruhnya Terhadap Pelaksanaan Fungsi Negara., Journal Hukum Indonesia Vol 4 No 2
- [14]. Hepburn, Eve., 2010, A Comparative Analysis of Island Region Autonomy Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Canadian Political Science Association (CPSA), Concordia University, Montreal, 1-3 June 2010, University of Edinburgh.
- [15]. Hoessein Bhenyamin.,1995, Sentralisasi dan Desentralisasi : Masalah dan Prospek, dalam Menelaah Format Politik Orde Baru. Jakarta:PPW-LIPI –Yayasan Insan Politika –Gramedia.
- [16]. Hirawan, Susiyanti.,2007. Desentralisasi Fiskal Sebagai Suatu Upaya Meningkatkan Penyediaan Layanan Publik (Bagi Orang Miskin) di Indonesia . Pidato pada Pengaugerahan Guru Besar di Fakultas Ekonomi, Universitas Indonesia, 24 Februari 2007.
- [17]. Jalan, Joytsna & Martin Ravallion., 2002. Geographic poverty traps? A micro model of consumption growth in China. Journal of Applied Econometrics 17 (4): 329–46.
- [18]. Jackson, R. (2008) Islands on the Edge: Exploring Islandness and Development in Four Australian Case Studies, Unpublished PhD thesis, University of Tasmania.
- [19]. JLGG Newsletter., 1999, Decentralization: New Legislation Boosts Japan's Local Authorities, Issue No.31, Summer
- [20]. Katorobo, James., 2004, Decentralization And Local Autonomy For Participatory Democracy, Makerere Institute of Social Research Kampala, 6th Global Forum on Reinventing Government Towards Participatory and Transparent Governance 24 – 27 May 2005, Seoul, Republic of Korea
- [21]. Keating, M. & McEwen, N. (eds)., 2006, Devolution and Public Policy: A Comparative Perspective. London: Routledge.
- [22]. Litvack, J., Ahmad, J., Bird, R., 1999, Rethinking Decentralization - A Discussion Paper , The World Bank
- [23]. Majumder, Rajarshi. 2012. Removing poverty and inequality in India: The role of infrastructure. MRPA Paper No. 40941, Munich Personal RePEc Archive (MRPA).
- [24]. McGarry, John., 2007, Asymmetry in federations, Federacies, and Unitary State:, Journal of Ethnopolitics vol 6, no 1, March 2007, pp 105-116.
- [25]. Meheret, Ayenew., 2007. A Rapid Assessment of Woreda Decentralization in Ethiopia, Decentralization in Ethiopia.In:TayeAssefa and Tegegne Gebere Egziabher, ed. 2007.
- [26]. Mick, Moore & James Putzel, 1999, Politics and Poverty: A Background Paper For The World Development Report 2000/1, <http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/>
- [27]. Musgrave, R.A. 1959. The theory of public finance : a study in public economy. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- [28]. Montero, Alfred P. & David J. Samuels (eds.), 2004, Decentralization and Democracy in Latin America

- (Notre Dame, IN: The University of Notre Dame Press, 2004), pp. ix+309. –
- [29]. Nurkin, Baharuddin., 2006., Otonomi Daerah dan Pengelolaan Sumber Daya Alam: Kasus Pengelolaan Hutan di Sulawesi Selatan., Jurnal Perennial, 2 (1) : 25-30
- [30]. Nurcholis, Hanif., 2007, Teori Dan Praktik Pemerintahan Dan Otonomi Daerah, Penerbit Grasindo Jakarta.
- [31]. Olowu, D. and Wunsch, J. S. 2004. Local Governance in Africa: The Challenges of Democratic Decentralization, Colorado: Lynne Rienner Publishers, Inc.
- [32]. Pike, A., Rodríguez-Pose, A. and Tomaney, J. (2007) "What kind of local and regional development and for whom?", *Regional Studies*, 41, 9, 1253–1269.
- [33]. Prasajo, Eko., 2009, Reformasi Kedua : Melanjutkan Estafet Reformasi, Jakarta. Penerbit Salemba Empat.
- [34]. Prud'homme, Remy., 1995, The Dangers Of Decentralization, The World Bank Research Observer, vol. 10, no. 2 (August 1995), pp. 201-20.© 1995 The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/THE WORLD BANK
- [35]. Requejo, Ferran, and Klaus-Jürgen Nagel, eds. 2011. *Federalism beyond Federations: Asymmetry and Processes of Resymmetrisation in Europe (Federalism Studies)*. Surrey/ Burlington: Ashgate.
- [36]. Rolla, G., 2005, L'organizzazione Territoriale Della Repubblica, Milano, 2005, p.75 ss
- [37]. Rondinelli Dennis & G. Shabbir Cheema., 1983, "Implementing Decentralization Policies: An Introduction" dalam Cheema and Rondinelli (ed.), *Decentralization and Development, Policy Implementation in Developing Countries*, California: Sage Publication in cooperation with UNCRD, h.15-16.
- [38]. Rondinelli, D. (1999). "What is Decentralization?" *Decentralization Briefing Notes*. J. Litvack and J. Seddon. Washington, IDRD/World Bank: 2-5.
- [39]. Salomo RV (2006) Pokok-pokok Pikiran Penyempurnaan UU No. 32 Tahun 2004 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah (Bagian Perangkat Daerah), Depdagri kerjasama GTZ, Jakarta (diakses 14 Juni 2018) <http://www.desentralisasi.org>.
- [40]. Sheldon, Pauline J. 2005, *The Challenges to Sustainability in Island Tourism* School of Travel Industry Management, University of Hawai'i.
- [41]. Smith, Brian C., 2012, *Decentralization The Territorial Dimension Of The State*; Diterjemahkan dan diterbitkan oleh Masyarakat Ilmu Pemerintahan Indonesia (MIPI), Jakarta.
- [42]. Smith, Brian C. 1985, *Decentralization: The Territorial Dimension of the State* (London: Asia Publishing House)
- [43]. Smoke, Paul, 2011, 'Decentralization in Africa: Goals, Dimensions, Myths and Challenges', p. 9; Fox, 'Fiscal Decentralization in Post-Conflict Countries', p. 5.
- [44]. Suwandi, Made., 2002, Pokok-Pokok Konsepsi Dasar Otonomi Daerah Di Indonesia, Jakarta, materi artiel tidak dipublikasikan.
- [45]. Sverrisson A. Crook R., 2001, *Decentralization and Poverty Alleviation in Developing Countries: A Comparative Analysis, or Is West Bengal Unique?*, Institute of Development Studies: Brighton;
- [46]. Tjokrowinoto, Moeljarto. 1999. *Pembangunan : Dilema dan Tantangan*. Yogyakarta : Pustaka Pelajar.
- [47]. Töpperwien, N. (2010). *Peace Mediation Essentials: Decentralization, Special Territorial Autonomy, and Peace Negotiations*. Sonnenbergstrasse 17: Mediation Support. Retrieved from [www.swisspeace.ch/mediation](http://www.swisspeace.ch/mediation)
- [48]. Warrington, E & D. Milne (2007), 'Island governance', in G. Baldacchino (ed), *A world of islands: an island studies reader*, Agenda Academic and Institute of Island Studies, Malta & Canada, pp. 379-427.
- [49]. Watts, Ronald L., 2000. "Asymmetrical Decentralization: Functional or Dysfunctional," *Indian Journal of Federal Studies* 1/2004 Copyright (c) Center for Federal Studies, Jamia Hamdard, New Delhi, India.
- [50]. White, S., 2011. 'Government Decentralization in the 21st Century: A Literature Review'. A Report of the CSIS Program of Crisis, Conflict and Cooperation. Washington: Centre for Strategic and International Studies
- [51]. World Bank, 2001. "Decentralization and Governance: Does Decentralization Improve Public Service Delivery?", in PremNotes No.55, June 2001, <http://www1.worldbank.org/prem/PREMNotes/>