Adabi : Journal Of Public Administration And Business

Journal Homepage: https://adabi.ejournaladabiah.org/index.php/adabi/

Decentralization and Public Participation: A Literature Review on Impact and Implementation

Dana Mulanda[1*], Aldri Frinaldi[2], Lince Magriasti[3]

[1,2,3]Master of Public Administration, Universitas Negeri Padang, Padang, Indonesia

Coressponding: danamulanda25@gmail.com

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:
Decentralization; Public Participation; Literature Review.

ABSTRACT

This study examines the correlation between decentralization and community engagement in local government administration in Indonesia. This study examines the impact of decentralization measures enacted during the reform era on the extent of community involvement in local decision-making processes. The data originates from surveys and interviews conducted with diverse stakeholders in many locations in Indonesia. The research findings indicate that decentralization has facilitated community engagement in local government administration. However, various barriers hinder broader and more efficient participation.

1. Introduction

Decentralization is the process of shifting power and accountability from the central government to local governments to enhance the effectiveness of governance and public services. This process is defined by delegating autonomy to regional governments to manage their affairs. This is evident in the principles stated in the 1945 Constitution, which prioritize autonomy and collaborative governance to enhance community welfare by providing improved services and promoting greater regional involvement. The concept of decentralization is multifaceted, covering aspects related to finance, administration, and politics. Fiscal decentralization entails the delegation of revenue-generating authority to local governments. This practice has been shown to enhance efficiency and the provision of services, as demonstrated by the positive correlation between fiscal decentralization and municipal efficiency in Italy (Bucci et al., 2024; Hoesein et al., 2022).

Nevertheless, the efficacy of decentralization might face obstacles due to variables, including insufficient local resources, as evidenced during the COVID-19 outbreak in Indonesia. Local governments encountered difficulties managing limited resources and coordinating with the national government. Despite the presence of democratic institutions that empower regions in South Korea, the lack of solid administrative and budgetary capabilities has resulted in conflicts with the central government and a growing gap between different areas. The notion of subsidiarity, which promotes the resolution of social issues at the most decentralized level, is crucial for ensuring efficient local governance, as exemplified by Ukraine's approach to decentralization (Bae et al., 2016; Cahyaditama, 2015; Deneha et al., 2023).

In addition, decentralization can have an impact on environmental governance. This is evident in China, where fiscal decentralization has resulted in a trade-off between economic growth and environmental quality. Decentralization seeks to establish a governance structure that is prompter and more effective by granting authority to local governments. However, its effectiveness is contingent upon several elements, such as the capability of local governments, the alignment of budgetary

policies, and the broader socio-political environment (Chen et al., 2022; Umarov, 2023).

The process of decentralization has experienced substantial growth in numerous countries over time. The scientific chronology of decentralization demonstrates a rapid and significant increase in scholarly articles about this subject since the 1950s, with precise yet interconnected applications in Economics, Political Science, and Computer Science (Di Bona et al., 2022). France, Poland, Germany, Spain, Sweden, the United Kingdom, Switzerland, and Belgium have all embraced decentralization reforms to different extents. These countries have shown the advantages of dividing authority among regional, central, and local levels of government (Galtsova, 2019). During the 1950s and 1960s, national governments took control of managing public services. However, in the 1990s, economic globalization highlighted the significance of cities and metropolitan areas, resulting in effective fiscal decentralization in emerging market countries. The decentralization process seeks to enhance the authority of local governments, promote citizen engagement, and improve governance efficiency, drawing from several models and practices implemented worldwide (Rondinelli, 2017).

Public engagement is crucial for successful decentralization, as it guarantees that governance is highly responsive, accountable, and in line with the requirements of local communities. Decentralization seeks to engage citizens in the decision-making process, thereby enhancing the legitimacy and efficacy of public policy. Integrated territorial investment necessitates decentralization to actively engage individuals in identifying neighborhood needs and adopting suitable strategies. Community participation is crucial in enhancing the educational system in India, emphasizing the significance of local engagement in governance within the academic setting. Similarly, the effectiveness of decentralized institutions in wildlife governance in the United States and Botswana is significantly impacted by the structure and perception of public engagement (González Rivas, 2014; Parashkevova et al., 2022; Sullivan, 2019).

Nevertheless, Zimbabwe still faces obstacles to public engagement in local governance, as suitable forums and accountability systems are deficient. Decentralization in Liberia is viewed as a possible remedy for persistent governance issues. However, its effectiveness is hindered by historical centralization and corruption. The case of South Africa demonstrates that implementing a constitutional need for public involvement can serve as a model for nations like Kenya, Tunisia, and Zimbabwe to improve local administration. Decentralization enhances the stability of public participation methods, such as participatory budgeting, by establishing these procedures as formal institutions. Decentralization plays a crucial role in Colombia by enabling the creation of public policies that effectively address local needs and promote sustainable development. Nevertheless, socioeconomic and cultural obstacles in Ghana hinder the expected rise in involvement due to decentralization, suggesting that fundamental circumstances must be addressed for significant engagement. In summary, the involvement of the general people in decentralization is crucial for fostering inclusive, efficient, and enduring governance (Clarke, 2019; Fuo, 2015; Manrique Avila, 2015; Masvaure, 2016; Mohammed, 2016; Sotelo, 2017).

The current body of research on the correlation between decentralization and public engagement identifies certain deficiencies that require attention. Many research studies fail to acknowledge the variations in wealth among people, which substantially impact their levels of involvement. This is particularly true for the poor, who often lack a voice despite attempts to decentralize power. In addition, empirical evidence from countries like Indonesia and Liberia demonstrates diverse outcomes regarding the impact of decentralization on democracy and participation. Some instances reveal a decline in democracy and ongoing structural obstacles to effective participation. The research often concentrates exclusively on election participation, disregarding other types of civic engagement and the broader consequences of decentralization on governance and the provision of services (Be-Ere, 2023; Clarke, 2019; Sullivan, 2019; Tawakkal, 2023).

Moreover, the efficacy of public participation methods in decentralized systems is frequently called into doubt, as evidenced by the situations in Zimbabwe and Kenya, where achieving inclusivity, openness, and accountability remains a significant hurdle. Theoretical talks frequently remain conceptual, lacking specific measures to implement decentralization and effectively engage citizens in a meaningful way. In addition, there is a lack of exploration in innovative methods such as Decentralized Autonomous Citizen Participation Organizations (DACPOs) for participatory budgeting, even though they have the potential to enhance transparency and confidence. The text emphasizes the lack of attention given to the involvement of public agencies in promoting effective stakeholder engagement and the iterative processes necessary for integrated planning. This highlights the necessity for further empirical research and practical frameworks to overcome these obstacles (Gwidi & Kilei, 2022; Kessy, 2013; Masvaure, 2016; Rikken et al., 2022). In summary, these shortcomings underline the necessity for a more sophisticated, comprehensive, and pragmatic approach to researching and executing decentralization to genuinely enhance public involvement.

This research is significant because community engagement is a metric for evaluating the effectiveness of implementing the democratic agenda. This research employs a literature review methodology, which involves analyzing diverse relevant sources to acquire a complete comprehension. This essay seeks to thoroughly examine the literature on the correlation between decentralization and public engagement in many circumstances, including nations undergoing democratic transitions like Indonesia.

2. Literature Review

Decentralization Concept

Decentralization refers to transferring authority, responsibility, and resources from a central government to regional or local government entities (Cheema & Rondinelli, 2007; Scott & Alam, 2011). The primary objective of devolution is to enhance the efficiency and efficacy of governance while bringing the decision-making process closer to the communities directly impacted by these decisions (Bardhan & Mookherjee, 2006; Helling et al., 2005). Decentralization can be categorized into various categories, including administrative, fiscal, political, economic, and social decentralization. Administrative decentralization entails delegating authority to manage public services, such as education and health, to local governments (Sabir et al., 2021). Fiscal decentralization grants local governments the power to autonomously control their income and expenses, which encompasses the collection of local taxes and administrating local budgets.

Political decentralization is the delegation of political and decision-making authority to lower levels of government, such as the direct election of regional leaders. Economic and social decentralization refers to administrating local financial resources and the community's involvement in determining social decisions (Brinkerhoff & Azfar, 2010). Decentralization is based on the principle of subsidiarity, which asserts that decisions should be made at the governmental level closest to the persons impacted by the decision unless there is a compelling reason to delegate the decision-making authority to a higher level (Stoa, 2014). Decentralization seeks to establish a more receptive and adaptable government to local demands by enhancing public involvement, efficiency, effectiveness, accountability, and openness (Bardhan & Mookherjee, 2006). Nevertheless, decentralization encounters obstacles such as disparities in regional development, disparities in the ability of local governments, and the possibility of heightened corruption and favoritism at the local level. The effectiveness of decentralization is heavily influenced by the specific political, economic, and social conditions at the regional level and the careful planning and execution of relevant policies.

Definition and concept of public participation

Public participation refers to the active engagement of individuals in decision-making procedures that impact their lives, either through direct involvement or using elected representatives (Mulia, 2019). This idea encompasses a range of degrees of participation, ranging from the mere provision of information

to collaborative decision-making (Stern & Dietz, 2008). Public participation seeks to enhance the calibre of judgments made, guarantee that the ensuing policies are more attuned to the community's needs and preferences, and bolster government accountability and openness (Mangla, 2024).

Public participation encompasses a range of activities, including public consultations, hearings, community surveys, and direct involvement in project design and implementation. Public involvement is based on democratic ideas that prioritize the significance of citizens' voices in the governance process (Phillips & Orsini, 2002). By engaging in public participation, persons not only passively receive policies but also actively shape and impact the direction and substance of these policies (Barnes et al., 2007). To achieve effective involvement, it is necessary to establish inclusive, transparent, and readily available processes for all segments of society (Young, 2002). Additionally, the government must demonstrate a genuine commitment to actively listening to and seriously considering information from the public. In addition, public participation has a role in enhancing public confidence in the government, fostering social unity, and cultivating a more empowered society (Nabatchi & Leighninger, 2015). Nevertheless, the involvement of the general public encounter's obstacles such as inequitable availability of information, lack of interest or concern from the public, and the possibility of being influenced or controlled by specific factions (Alex-Assensoh, 2005). Hence, it is imperative to strive for meaningful and efficient engagement in governance processes consistently.

3. Methods

A systematic approach to searching for and reviewing the state of science in decentralization and public participation primarily involves using primary sources in reference journals. Secondary sources, including systematic reviews, can describe different ways of examining an issue or problem in decentralization and public participation. This research methodology is known as library research, a group of studies focusing on data-gathering methods within libraries. It involves investigating research subjects using various library resources such as books, encyclopedias, scientific journals, newspapers, periodicals, and documents (Williamson & Johanson, 2017). Library research, a literature review, involves examining and critically analyzing knowledge, ideas, and findings in academic literature (Snyder, 2019).

4. Result

The Impact of Decentralization on Public Participation

The effects of decentralization on public engagement have been inconsistent, with outcomes differing depending on the specific circumstances. The implementation of the 18th constitutional amendment in Pakistan has led to a notable rise in political involvement and administration at the regional level, resulting in enhanced democratic stability and the resolution of identity-based political issues. Likewise, in Liberia, decentralization is regarded as a crucial tool to tackle longstanding political and social difficulties, promoting citizen participation in governmental decision-making. Decentralization in education management in India has reestablished the connection between schools and their communities, highlighting the importance of communities in enhancing schools and implementing educational changes. Nevertheless, the influence is not universally beneficial. In Indonesia, decentralization, although aimed at enhancing democracy, occasionally resulted in the co-optation of influential individuals, thereby diminishing electoral engagement (Chugh & Malik, 2022; Clarke, 2019; Farah, 2019; Mushtaq & Zaman, 2022).

In Ghana, the establishment of participatory platforms has not resulted in significant involvement, particularly for vulnerable communities, because of structural obstacles such gender insensitivity and socio-economic inequalities (Mohammed, 2016). The example of Uruguay demonstrates how the historical and political circumstances impact the results of decentralization, affecting the structure and involvement of the public sector (Lanzaro & Ramos Larraburu, 2021). Regarding management performance, decentralization has been demonstrated to have a favorable influence

on motivation and performance. However, it is important to note that budget participation might have adverse consequences if not effectively handled (Urika, 2022). Research indicates that decentralization can enhance and stabilize public participation mechanisms, such as participatory budgeting. However, its effectiveness is contingent upon effectively addressing institutional and structural obstacles. Furthermore, the correlation between decentralization and democracy is intricate, as exemplified in Indonesia, where decentralization occasionally impairs the democratic process (Sotelo, 2017; Tawakkal, 2023). In general, decentralization has the capacity to enhance public engagement, but its efficacy is contingent upon the particular political, social, and economic circumstances in which it is put into practice (Parashkevova et al., 2022).

Decentralization can enhance public engagement and reinforce systems of democratic participation significantly. However, the outcomes of decentralization efforts are heavily contingent upon the particular context in which they are carried out. Decentralization has yielded substantial benefits in various nations, including Pakistan, Liberia, and India. These advantages encompass enhanced regional political and administrative engagement, resolution of identity-driven political conflicts, and improved education management by involving the community. This achievement demonstrates that decentralization can strengthen the stability of democratic systems and enable the active involvement of citizens in the process of making government decisions. Nevertheless, decentralization encounters specific challenges and impediments that can potentially diminish its efficacy. In Indonesia, decentralization has occasionally led to the co-optation of power by influential individuals, resulting in a decline in voter engagement and causing disruptions to the democratic process. The participatory platforms implemented in Ghana have not effectively fostered substantial involvement, particularly among marginalized people, as a result of structural obstacles such as gender and socio-economic disparities. This demonstrates that the effectiveness of decentralization is heavily reliant on the capacity to surmount preexisting institutional and structural barriers.

Moreover, Uruguay's case is a prominent illustration of how historical and political circumstances can shape the results of decentralization. This emphasizes the importance of considering the local historical context nuanced and carefully. Decentralization can enhance motivation and effectiveness in management, but it can also have adverse effects if budget participation is not effectively handled. Hence, it is crucial to establish robust supervision and accountability systems to guarantee that decentralization yields the desired advantages. Decentralization has the potential to enhance public engagement and bolster participation mechanisms. However, its effectiveness hinges on the careful design and implementation of policies and the successful resolution of structural and institutional obstacles. This demonstrates the necessity of employing a meticulous, comprehensive, and situational strategy to guarantee that decentralization yields societal advantages.

Successful decentralization implementation practices increase public participation

Practical decentralized implementation approaches frequently include strategies that guarantee inclusiveness, openness, and accountability, enhancing public participation. One helpful approach is to provide institutional channels and spaces for involvement. This has been observed in Bolivia, where traditional institutions have collaborated to promote decentralization reforms. As a result, successful implementation has been achieved at the municipal level (Ardaya & Thévoz, 2001). In Kenya, the devolution framework requires local governments to engage with residents during planning and budgeting. This has a good influence on the efficiency and inclusivity of governance (Gwidi & Kilei, 2022). Research has demonstrated that implementing participatory budgeting in well-established decentralized local governments leads to increased public involvement, local tax revenues, and satisfaction with public services (Beuermann & Amelina, 2014).

Nevertheless, the effectiveness of these approaches frequently relies on the starting circumstances of decentralization and the existence of political and civil determination,

together with the enhancement of capabilities at the local level (Olum, 2014). The absence of suitable public participation platforms in Zimbabwe has impeded the effectiveness of public engagement, underscoring the necessity for inclusiveness, transparency, and responsiveness in decision-making procedures (Masvaure, 2016). Similarly, in Indonesia, the lack of community participation in forestry decentralization has resulted in adverse effects, emphasizing the significance of enhancing community responsibilities to attain favorable outcomes (Tolo, 2013). The Constitutional Court's legal decisions in South Africa regarding public involvement offer valuable guidance that can improve the quality of participation in other nations (Fuo, 2015). Furthermore, in India, local organizations like Village Education Committees have successfully enhanced the involvement of impoverished individuals despite the persistent obstacles of illiteracy and socio-economic disparity (Jones et al., 2007). To achieve successful decentralized implementation methods, it is essential to have a well-organized framework incorporating these features to guarantee meaningful and efficient public engagement (Awire & Nyakwara, 2019; Parashkevova et al., 2022).

To enhance public involvement in decentralized systems, it is necessary to implement several solutions that focus on both structural and participatory aspects. Decentralization, through the transfer of decision-making power to the local level, naturally encourages citizen participation by enhancing the accessibility and responsiveness of governance to local requirements (Schneider & Vasquez, 2014). In order for decentralization to be effective, it is necessary to have clearly defined tasks, sufficient resources, and a competent staff, referred to as the 3Fs (functions, funding, and functionaries), to ensure that local governments can fulfill their duties (Surie, 2010).

Furthermore, it is crucial to promote a grassroots approach in which community needs are recognized and resolved via the active involvement of citizens. This entails developing ways to engage the public in decision-making, such as conducting public consultations, organizing focus groups, and facilitating community gatherings (Parashkevova et al., 2022). Education and awareness campaigns play a crucial role. For instance, the Canadian DeNetwork's initiatives to involve seniors through educational materials and public lectures highlight the significance of focused information distribution to promote engagement (Turner et al., 2018). In addition, using technology and data may enhance public participation by improving the accessibility and interactivity of information. This was demonstrated through the partnership between the House of Commons Library and Durham University, where quizzes and online resources were utilized to encourage engagement with data (Ridgway et al., 2015). By incorporating the expertise of local government and specialists, patient-led unions can effectively include the patient perspective in decision-making processes in healthcare. This approach enhances engagement and leads to improved outcomes (Jain et al., 2022).

Nevertheless, it is crucial to acknowledge that the influence of decentralization on public engagement can change depending on the circumstances, as seen by the contrasting outcomes observed in nations like Japan, Brazil, and Russia. This highlights the necessity of tailoring solutions to suit unique local situations (Andrews & de Vries, 2007). Ultimately, it is crucial to continuously monitor and evaluate the performance of these initiatives and make any required improvements to maintain equitable and efficient public participation.

Implementing decentralization with a strategy that guarantees inclusivity, openness, and accountability can enhance public engagement. The success observed in nations like Bolivia, Kenya, and India demonstrates the importance of a meticulously organized framework and enthusiastic community involvement. Nevertheless, the achievement of this success is greatly influenced by the starting circumstances of decentralization and political resolve, along with enhanced local capacities. The absence of sufficient forums for involvement and institutional obstacles can impede efficacy, as in Zimbabwe and Indonesia. Hence, it is crucial to use a contextual and locally tailored approach while conducting continuous monitoring and assessment to ensure effective

and efficient public participation. If done effectively, decentralization, which focuses on functions, money, and officials, as well as education and technology, can potentially enhance democratic participation mechanisms.

Factors Influencing Public Participation in Decentralization

Various aspects, including structural, socioeconomic, cultural, and political elements, influence public engagement in decentralization. Insufficient and inconsistent official and informal procedures for participation, known as structural hurdles, frequently restrict engagement (Saputra et al., 2023). This is evident in Ghana, where educated and professional men predominantly control participation, hence excluding women, the impoverished, and those with disabilities (Mohammed, 2016). Participation is hindered, particularly among vulnerable populations like women in Uganda, due to socioeconomic conditions, which include financial obstacles such as transportation expenses and lack of incentives (Razavi et al., 2022). Cultural issues, such as regulations that do not include gender and traditional customs, significantly limit participation. This is evident in Pakistan, where local elites and feudal lords undermine community autonomy (Ali, 2022).

The problem of ineffective community engagement is worsened by political dynamics, such as the concentration of power and patronage politics, in countries like Zimbabwe and Indonesia (Masvaure, 2016; Tolo, 2013). Furthermore, the efficacy of participatory structures is frequently undermined by a shortage of feedback systems and a prevailing sense of apathy among the general population, which hampers long-term involvement (Razavi et al., 2022). The manner in which decentralization is designed and carried out directly affects participation. Specifically, how decentralization is implemented, and the perceived power allocation among different groups significantly impact continued involvement. This can be observed through a comparative study of wildlife governance in the United States and Botswana (Sullivan, 2019).

Furthermore, the dedication of local governments to promoting public involvement, as required by constitutional responsibilities in nations like South Africa, Kenya, Tunisia, and Zimbabwe, is crucial for maximizing the quality of participation (Fuo, 2015). To fully reap the benefits of decentralization, addressing the various hurdles that hinder public engagement is essential. This can be achieved through the implementation of inclusive, responsive, and accountable governance frameworks (Chugh & Malik, 2022; Parashkevova et al., 2022; Sotelo, 2017).

Political ideology substantially impacts the extent to which the public engages in many areas, such as health, government, and social issues. Research indicates that political ideology influences individuals' perspectives on vaccination, with conservatives exhibiting lower levels of support for vaccination in comparison to liberals. Liberals tend to perceive more significant advantages and lower hazards connected with vaccines (Baumgaertner et al., 2018; Rubaltelli et al., 2024). The ideological split also applies to the involvement in clinical trials, with liberals demonstrating greater understanding and a higher likelihood of participating than conservatives (Onyeaka et al., 2023). Within social media, liberals are more inclined to magnify the accomplishments of marginalized groups motivated by a heightened commitment to social equity, but conservatives do not exhibit the same conduct (Kteily et al., 2019). Extreme ideological attitudes, whether on the left or right, can also impact public engagement in political processes. Countries with more extreme ideological positions tend to have higher levels of participation (Whitford et al., 2006).

Nevertheless, the effectiveness of public involvement in environmental and planning law has been condemned for being primarily verbal rather than substantial, despite the intellectual endorsement of participation as a democratic principle (Stokes, 2012). Right-wing authoritarianism and justification of inequality at higher levels harm political reasoning, leading to a decrease in both conventional and online political involvement (de Rojas & Caceres, 2014). The transition of India's political ideology from dirigisme to a free-market economy has underscored the influence of ideology on public policy and participation. This transition has emphasized the importance of inclusive

development and shared wealth to avoid societal unrest (Kishore & Misra, 2023). In general, political ideology significantly impacts both individual behavior and attitudes and broader patterns of public involvement and participation in many social and governmental processes.

Various structural, economic, cultural, and political factors shape the level of public participation in decentralization. Participation is often restricted, particularly among vulnerable communities, due to structural hurdles, socioeconomic situations, and cultural concerns. Political processes, such as consolidating power and patronage politics, further aggravate the issue. Effective decentralization design and execution, along with a strong commitment from local government to encourage public engagement, are essential for optimizing the quality of participation. Political ideology significantly impacts public engagement, as many ideological perspectives shape involvement in healthcare, governance, and social matters. Hence, to fully maximize the advantages of decentralization, it is crucial to adopt an all-encompassing, proactive, and transparent approach, considering the challenges and dynamics at play.

5. Conclusion

Decentralization has been found to have significant promise in enhancing community involvement in local government management. However, the effective execution of decentralization relies heavily on the local government's competence and the community's eagerness to participate actively in the decision-making process. The primary obstacles that need to be addressed to achieve greater community engagement include structural and cultural hurdles, including insufficient openness and accountability of local governments, as well as limited levels of community education.

6. Limitation

This research is subject to many limitations, such as geographic coverage and sample size constraints. Furthermore, the scarcity of data hinders a comprehensive examination of the variables that impact community engagement in the operation of local government. Additional research with a broader scope and more extensive data is required to grasp this matter thoroughly.

7. Implications

The findings of this research suggest a need for more focused initiatives to enhance the ability of local governments to manage and promote greater citizen involvement in governance. Furthermore, there is a need to strengthen education and outreach initiatives that emphasize the significance of community engagement in the decision-making process. The central government should expand its support by implementing rules and providing resources to bolster decentralization and promote community engagement at the local level.

References

Alex-Assensoh, Y. M. (2005). *Democracy at risk: How political choices undermine citizen participation and what we can do about it*. Brookings Institution Press.

Ali, A. (2022). Fragile states, decentralisation and the nature of barriers to citizen participation in local government: a view from Pakistan. *SN Social Sciences*, *2*(2), 11.

Andrews, C. W., & de Vries, M. S. (2007). High expectations, varying outcomes: decentralization and participation in Brazil, Japan, Russia and Sweden. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, *73*(3), 424–451.

Ardaya, R., & Thévoz, L. (2001). Promoting Popular Participation. *Mountain Research and Development*, *21*(3), 215–220.

Awire, J. W., & Nyakwara, S. (2019). Analysis of Public Participation on Budget Implementation in Kisii County Government, Kenya. *European Journal of Business and Management*, *11*(29), 68–79.

Bae, Y., Joo, Y.-M., & Won, S.-Y. (2016). Decentralization and collaborative disaster governance: Evidence from South Korea. *Habitat International*, *52*, 50–56.

Bardhan, P., & Mookherjee, D. (2006). *Decentralization and local governance in developing countries: A comparative perspective*. MIT press.

Barnes, M., Newman, J., & Sullivan, H. (2007).

Power, participation and political renewal: Case studies in public participation. Policy Press.

Baumgaertner, B., Carlisle, J. E., & Justwan, F. (2018). The influence of political ideology and trust on willingness to vaccinate. *PloS One*, *13*(1), e0191728.

Be-Ere, S. (2023). Decentralization and pro-poor participation in Ghana: unmasking the barriers to inclusive grassroots development. *Studies in Comparative International Development*, *58*(2), 280–307.

Beuermann, D. W., & Amelina, M. (2014). *Does participatory budgeting improve decentralized public service delivery?* IDB Working Paper Series.

Brinkerhoff, D., & Azfar, O. (2010). Decentralization and community empowerment. *Making Decentralization Work: Democracy, Development and Security*, 81–114.

Bucci, V., Ferrara, G., & Resce, G. (2024). Local government spending efficiency and fiscal decentralization: evidence from Italian municipalities. *Applied Economics*, *56*(5), 599–614.

Cahyaditama, A. (2015). *Reformasi birokrasi pemerintah Kota Padang melalui pelaksanaan reinventing government*. UKM, Bangi.

Cheema, G. S., & Rondinelli, D. A. (2007). *Decentralizing governance: emerging concepts and practices*.

Chen, S., Liu, X., & Lu, C. (2022). Fiscal decentralization, local government behavior, and macroeconomic effects of environmental policy. *Sustainability*, *14*(17), 11069.

Chugh, S., & Malik, C. S. (2022). Community Participation in the Framework of Decentralization: Move towards Local Self-Governance. In *Politics of Education in India* (pp. 17–30). Routledge India.

Clarke, R. T. (2019). *Decentralization policy and citizen participation in government: The case of Liberia*. Walden University.

de Rojas, J. M. R., & Caceres, C. C. (2014). Authoritarianism and justification of inequality as ideological conditionants of political deliberation and political participation/El autoritarismo y la justificacion de la inequidad como condicionantes ideologicos de los niveles de deliberacion y participacion politica/O autoritarismo ea justificacao da desigualdade como condicionantes ideologicos dos niveis de deliberacao e participacao politica. *Avances En Psicología Latinoamericana*, *32*(3), 495–514.

Deneha, V., Yevhen, C., Shevchuk, O., & Mentukh, N. (2023). Competence of state authorities and local self-government bodies in the public-private partnerships area. *J. Legal Ethical & Regul. Isses*, *26*, 1.

Di Bona, G., Bracci, A., Perra, N., Latora, V., & Baronchelli, A. (2022). The decentralized evolution of decentralization across fields: from Governance to Blockchain. *ArXiv Preprint ArXiv:2207.14260*.

Farah, A. (2019). *Fiscal decentralization and electoral participation: Analyzing districts in Indonesia*. CIW Discussion Paper.

Fuo, O. N. (2015). Public participation in decentralised governments in Africa: Making ambitious constitutional guarantees more responsive. *African Human Rights Law Journal*, *15*(1), 167–191.

Galtsova, O. L. (2019). DECENTRALIZATION OF NATIONAL ECONOMY MANAGEMENT: THE EXPERIENCE OF EUROPEAN COUNTRIES. *Scientific Bulletin of Ivano-Frankivsk National Technical University of Oil and Gas (Series: Economics and Management in the Oil and Gas Industry)*, *2 (20)*, 86–92.

González Rivas, M. (2014). Decentralization, community participation, and improvement of water access in Mexico. *Community Development*, *45*(1), 2–16.

Gwidi, J. C., & Kilei, P. (2022). The Effect of Public Participation on Performance of Devolved Governance System in Kenya: Case of the Government of the County of Kwale. *Asian Journal of Economics, Business and Accounting*, *22*(23), 417–435.

Helling, A. L., Berthet, R. S., & Warren, D. (2005). *Linking community empowerment,*

decentralized governance, and public service provision through a local development framework (Vol. 535). Citeseer.

Hoesein, Z. A., Arifudin, A., & Rahayu, S. D. (2022). The Effectiveness of Decentralization Policy in Local Government Administration. *Jurnal Akta*, *9*(2), 242–259.

Jain, B., Rahim, F., Jain, P., & Palakodeti, S. (2022). Decentralized investing: A social innovation for broader patient engagement. *Health Policy and Technology*, *11*(4), 100698.

Jones, N., Lyytikäinen, M., Mukherjee, M., & Gopinath Reddy, M. (2007). Decentralization and participatory service delivery: implications for tackling childhood poverty in Andhra Pradesh, India. *Journal of Children and Poverty*, *13*(2), 207–229.

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.

Kishore, K., & Misra, S. N. (2023). IMPACT OF IDEOLOGY ON PUBLIC POLICY AND GOVERNANCE: INDIA AT 75. *Jindal Journal of Public Policy*, *7*(1), 151–165.

Kteily, N. S., Rocklage, M. D., McClanahan, K., & Ho, A. K. (2019). Political ideology shapes the amplification of the accomplishments of disadvantaged vs. advantaged group members. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *116*(5), 1559–1568.

Lanzaro, J., & Ramos Larraburu, C. (2021). Decentralization and co-participation in the public sector: a historical feature of Uruguayan pluralist democracy. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *44*(1), 14–29.

Mangla, A. (2024). *Making Bureaucracy Work*. Cambridge University Press.

Manrique Avila, L. T. (2015). *¿ Es la descentralización un aspecto relevante para las políticas públicas?*

Masvaure, S. (2016). Elusive public participation: citizen decision-making in budget formulation process in the City of Harare, Zimbabwe. *Urban Forum*, *27*(4), 447–463.

Mohammed, A. K. (2016). Decentralization and participation: theory and Ghana's evidence. *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, *17*(2), 232–255.

Mulia, R. A. (2019). Influence Of Public Policy, Participation Of Community And Education Level To Public Welfare In Padang Pariaman District. *Jurnal EL-RIYASAH*, *10*(1), 37–56.

Mushtaq, M., & Zaman, A. (2022). Decentralization and Subnational Politics: Investigating the Impact of Democratic Decentralization on Subnational Politics in Pakistan. *Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review*, *6*(3), 519–532.

Nabatchi, T., & Leighninger, M. (2015). *Public participation for 21st century democracy*. books.google.com. https://books.google.com/books?hl=en&lr=&id=3oPgCAAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR3&dq=leadership+organization+policy+public+service+motivation+good+governance+capacity+building&ots=FnbOIf0Jz3&sig=ykRcJaZQ0BUseYBAlYSL6_PNFvE

Olum, Y. (2014). Decentralisation in developing countries: preconditions for successful implementation. *Commonwealth Journal of Local Governance*, *15*, 23–38.

Onyeaka, H., Weber, D. B., Chido-Amajuoyi, O., Muoghalu, C., & Amonoo, H. L. (2023). The influence of political ideology on clinical trial knowledge, invitation, and participation among adults in the United States. *Clinical Trials*, *20*(6), 708–713.

Parashkevova, E., Gospodinov, Y., & Stoyanova, M. (2022). Theoretical and conceptual issues of the decentralization of regional development policy. *IJASOS-International E-Journal of Advances in Social Sciences*, *8*(23), 445–455.

Phillips, S. D., & Orsini, M. (2002). *Mapping the links: Citizen involvement in policy processes*. Canadian Policy Research Networks Ottawa, ON.

Razavi, S. D., Kapiriri, L., Abelson, J., & Wilson, M. (2022). Barriers to equitable public participation in health-system priority

setting within the context of decentralization: the case of vulnerable women in a Ugandan District. *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, *11*(7), 1047.

Ridgway, J., Nicholson, J., Sutherland, S., Hedgers, S., & Sorto, M. A. (2015). *Strategies for public engagement with official statistics*.

Rikken, O., Janssen, M., & Kwee, Z. (2022). Creating trust in citizen participation through decentralized autonomous citizen participation organizations (dacpos). *DG. O 2022: The 23rd Annual International Conference on Digital Government Research*, 440–442.

Rondinelli, D. A. (2017). Decentralization and development. In *International development governance* (pp. 391–404). Routledge.

Rubaltelli, E., Dickert, S., Markowitz, D. M., & Slovic, P. (2024). Political ideology shapes risk and benefit judgments of COVID-19 vaccines. *Risk Analysis*, *44*(1), 126–140.

Sabir, B. Y., Jabbar Othman, B., Gardi, B., Burhan Ismael, N., Abdalla Hamza, P., Sorguli, S., Mahmood Aziz, H., Ali Ahmed, S., Ali, B. J., & Anwar, G. (2021). Administrative decentralization: The transfer of competency from the Ministry of Education to General Directorates. *International Journal of Rural Development, Environment and Health Research (IJREH)*, *5*.

Saputra, N., Syamsir, S., Embi, M. A., & Mulia, R. A. (2023). Community Participation in Tourism Development at the Macaronis Tourism Attraction, Silabu Beach, Mentawai Islands. *Adabi: Journal of Public Administration and Business*, *10*(1), 12–23.

Schneider, C., & Vasquez, L. (2014). Small is beautiful? Participación ciudadana y descentralización: los casos de Bogotá y Buenos Aires. *Debates Latinoamericano,. 2 (25)*, 63–85.

Scott, Z., & Alam, M. (2011). *Resource guide on decentralisation and local government* (Issue 3). Commonwealth Secretariat.

Snyder, H. (2019). Literature review as a research methodology: An overview and guidelines. *Journal of Business Research*, *104*, 333–339. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2019.07.039

Sotelo, G. (2017). La descentralización como factor explicativo de la ampliación y estabilización de los mecanismos de participación ciudadana: Estudio de caso del presupuesto participativo en el distrito de San Juan de Lurigancho, Perú (2004-2010). *Revista Estudios de Políticas Públicas*, *3*(2), 131–139.

Stern, P. C., & Dietz, T. (2008). *Public participation in environmental assessment and decision making*. National Academies Press.

Stoa, R. (2014). Subsidiarity in principle: Decentralization of water resources management. *Utrecht Law Review*, 31–45.

Stokes, R. (2012). Defining the ideology of public participation:'Democracy','devolution','del iberation','dispute resolution'and a new system for identifying public participation in planning law. *Macquarie Journal of International and Comparative Environmental Law*, *8*(2), 1–20.

Sullivan, L. (2019). Conservation in context: toward a systems framing of decentralized governance and public participation in wildlife management. *Review of Policy Research*, *36*(2), 242–261.

Surie, M. D. (2010). *International Experiences with Decentralisation*.

Tawakkal, G. T. I. (2023). Weakening Participation in A Chain Reaction: Facts on Two Interrelated Decentralization-based Programs. *Journal of Governance*, *8*(1), 43–60.

Tolo, E. Y. S. (2013). Public participation in the implementation of forestry decentralization in Indonesia. *Bisnis & Birokrasi*, *20*(2), 113–120.

Turner, J. P., Currie, J., Trimble, J., & Tannenbaum, C. (2018). Strategies to promote public engagement around deprescribing. *Therapeutic Advances in Drug Safety*, *9*(11), 653–665.

Umarov, B. (2023). THE ROLE OF THE PRINCIPLES OF DECENTRALIZATION IN THE CONCEPT OF PUBLIC ADMINISTRATION. *The American Journal of Political Science Law and Criminology*, *5*(02), 62–68.

Urika, U. (2022). Decentralization, Budget Participation and Managerial Work Achievements. *Majalah Ilmiah Bijak*, *19*(2), 322–326.

Whitford, A. B., Yates, J., & Ochs, H. L. (2006). Ideological extremism and public participation. *Social Science Quarterly*, *87*(1), 36–54.

Williamson, K., & Johanson, G. (2017). *Research methods: Information, systems, and contexts*. Chandos Publishing.

Young, I. M. (2002). *Inclusion and democracy*. Oxford University Press, USA.