

## **Decentralization and Development in Public Policy Implementation Perspective; Case Study in Indonesia**

**Prof. Dr. Suratman Nur, M.Si**

*Professor in Public Policy at Social and Political Science Faculty, University of Hasanuddin, Makassar, Indonesia*

---

**Abstract:** *This paper aims to analyze the application of models of public policy implementation in a decentralized system of governance and development in Indonesia. The implementation of the decentralization policy and the construction of the new order Government embraced the rational model of top-down implementation of the governance reform, and on the implementation of the decentralization policy and the development of bottom-up models adhere to the decentralize. Both of these models are seen likely to overly simplify the complexity of implementation, so that one of the models that are seen can minimize the occurrence of the failure of the implementation of the policy of decentralization and development is a model synthesis. This synthesis it is possible to Model applied by hooking into the inter-organizational implementation in the form of a network between organizations. Today, the network organization model had been discussed in the theory of public policy implementation.*

**Keywords:** *Public policy, Sintetis Model*

---

### **I. Introduction**

Decentralized system of Government in the last decade become a global trend is not only much applied in developed countries, but also in many developing countries. The Trend is in line with the other big trend, namely a change of the conception of government to governance. On the concept of “government”, Government (both Central and Local) were placed as main actors of development, while on the paradigm of governance, synergy between the Government, private, and society in the Central Government and regions becomes important. Therefore, the application of the decentralized system is one aspect that is very important to realize a good governance, more efficient, effective, and democratic. System decentralization as one of the dimensions in the process of the democratization demand government capabilities in the formulation, implementation, and evaluation of policies. Of the cycle, the most important phase of the implementation of the policy, due to a policy that has been set will not be successfully achieved its goal if not implemented properly.

Analysis of the implementation public policy can be seen from various views about model implementation public policy that splits outline the development model implementation public policy into four stages, namely: ( 1 ) model analysis failure, looked implementation as the process interaction between drafting purpose to action, ( 2 ) model rational ( top-down ) identifies factors which one makes implementation success, ( 3 ) bottom-up model looked the importance of other factors and interaction between the government and its citizens, and ( 4 ) model results synthesis, implementation regarded as evolution, learning, and as policy action continuum [17]. In addition to the four the model, one model much discussed in the study implementation public policy namely model tissue between organization [16],[17].

This paper aims to analyze the application of models of public policy implementation in a decentralized system of Government Indonesia. The discussion begins with an explanation of the concept of public policies and decentralization, and then subsequently explained the rational policy implementation model of top-down policy implementation model, bottom-up, public policy implementation model synthesis and model of the network between organizations, as well as the prospect of its application in the system of decentralized governance of Indonesia.

### **II. The Theoretical**

#### **2.1 Public Policy and Decentralization**

Initially, public policy study is based on contributions from four main figure namely: Lasswell, Simon, Lindblom and Easton. Lasswell (1970 ) was a major public policy study apply as part of social science. Simon (1945), is experts who contribute in the context of rational choice in decision making. Lindblom (1959) much writing about Incrementalism scientifically. Easton (1953) contribute political system, through model that really affect public policy study means conceptualize relations between the input process, output, and environment public policy.

The study of public policy at first only limited on the issue of defense, foreign relations, and a matter of

law and order [30]. However, study area of public policy currently has been beyond the third fields, and has includes a variety of fields, as; education, health, housing, tourism, agriculture, industry, trade, and transportation, and the government.

The Policy idea is not a definite term or self-fact [10]. Public policy is whatever governments choose to do or not to do any [4]. Meanwhile, public policies are those policies developed by governmental bodies and officials [1]. The Meaning and defines public policy is a decision exercised by government official authorized to public interests. Public interest is the whole of fusion opinions, and crystallization interests and the demands of the public.

A term of decentralization having a distinct meaning to different persons, and approach towards decentralization is very varied between the state of being one with other nations. Nevertheless, there is a generally agreed in both the advanced countries as well as in developing countries, that decentralizing is one of the very important in implementing the government better, efficient, effective, and democratic. Relate it, to decode decentralized as the displacement authority or the division of power in planning that the government and the management and decision-making of the national level to the level of the region [22]. Decentralization in realization is manifested into the shape of regional autonomy which are often is understood as ownership of power to self-determination and move the bits around to attain goals that has been agreed upon together [5]. Purport to governing and to take care of his household own this is what was actually a principle is an essential in understanding regional autonomy.

The emergence of decentralized in most countries in the world are triggered by reasons of politics and economics. Ford (1999) and Javier (2000) expressed the need for a decentralized political consideration findings in several countries [25]. In Latin America, decentralization is part of the process of democratization which the autocracy regime was replaced by a Government that is elected by the people under a new Constitution. In Africa, the spread of multi-party political system has resulted in demands of implemented voice of the people in decision-making. In Ethiopia, decentralization is in reaction to demands from regional or ethnic groups against a control participation in the political process. In Mozambique or Uganda, decentralization is also the result of a long civil war, where local politics has enabled wider participation for the warring factions. As for the economic reasons the need for decentralization, including consideration of the efficiency in the allocation of economic resources, as well as to improve the competitiveness and Government (competitiveness) spur innovation efforts, so that the Government can do something to satisfy the expectations of the community.

In line with reason about the need for decentralization, then decentralized in general can be grouped into 4 typology, namely; (a) political decentralization, ( b ) an administrative decentralization, ( c ) fiscal decentralization, and ( d ) market decentralized or economy decentralized. Decentralized political aims to give to the people access to public decision-making, while administrative decentralization tend to focus on redistribution of the authority and responsibility in public service provision of services between different levels of government. In this case, having a triple form main administrative decentralization, the deconcentration, delegates and devolution [22].

Furthermore, fiscal decentralization aims to give authority to local institutions to perform functions that have been delegated/assigned, as well as formulating a decision on the expenditure of the budget, as well as the authority to dig up sources of income on their own. As for the decentralized market economy or market is directed at the occurrence of a responsibility in implementing the functions of the Government from the public sector to the private sector. The market decentralization is a perfect form of decentralization, In concrete may constitute privatization policy or deregulation.

## **2.2 Public Policy Implementation (Top-Down Models)**

In the development of policy implementation studies, more influenced in figure in the development of the study of implementation of public policy [15], [17]. Pressman and Wildavsky laid the Foundation for the study of public policy, although at the previous time this field is a field that is considered easy (unproblematic) in the study of the policy. Policy makers assume that once the decision is made then the Government agencies will be easy to implement them.

However, describing the importance of this study after they show the failures of the government agencies achieve the aim of job creation programs in Oakland, California set by policymakers [11]. This study brings the debate about the conditions required for the implementation of the policy's success. These matters become the essence of model top-down policy implementation [12].

Model of the public policy is a rational top-down implementation is the process of interaction between the determination of the purpose and action to achieve its goals. It is essentially the ability to establish relation in chains of causation to policies can affect change. The implementation of the policy according to Sabatier and Mazmanian (1979) is a function of three of one variable are intertwined, namely; (1) the problem characteristics; (2) the program management structure is reflected in the wide variety of operational policy regulations; and (3) the factors outside the regulations. Thought Sabatier and Mazmanian assumes that an implementation will be

effective when the bureaucratic implementation complies with what has been outlined by Regulation (technical operations manual) [33]

The rational implementation system top-down model or type this ideal then developed that submits model questioning as ideal model is implementation [3]. This idea obviously compatible with weber's construction (1946) about type ideal bureaucracy. It means any organization, implementation is activity where in government organization identical with bureaucracy. The organizational structure of bureaucracy made to operate properly through sensorial authority as the responsibility and rights to give proper service [15].Avery important aspect in the implementation of public policy compliance. Adherence referred to is unmannerly obedient principles and law. Because the policy of law or ordinance is always based on certain so the implementation of the policy must also be obedient to the law [1].

Policy implementation of rational top-down models applied in the administration of the new order, although Act No. 5 of 1974 on local governance issues is decentralized, and the pilot project intends to stress the autonomy at district level areas/municipalities, but in its execution autonomic regions at once made the area administration. Consequently practice is regional leaders as well as the head of the region. Notch the head of the region is an extension of the hands of the central government. The role of regional head as means of control the central government more dominant than her position as head of the region. This would mean spirit of centralistic in implementing this policy is still dominant

The spirit of implementation tends to be uniform and forced all the context and environment without worrying about social situations that exist in the area. The implementation contains the idea of making people do what is ordered and controls the sequence of stages in a system, and implementation is a matter of developing a control program that minimizes conflict and deviation from the objectives that have been set by policy.

The application of the public policy implementation model of rational top-down models with emphasis on the implementation of national spirit, throughout the 70s and 80s, for example, Indonesia experienced sustained economic growth and political stability. However, in the long run, such centralization has caused such impact; injustice, lack of accountability, the slowness of the construction of social infrastructure, low levels of control of public projects, slowing the development of social economy in the institutional area, as well as the impact area of inequality.

Policy implications that affect inequality in Indonesia results of research Hendra Esmara (1975), Islam and Khan (1986), and Nasjid Majidi (1997), shows that during the period 1968-1997 index of inequality of income between regions increases. DKI Jakarta, East Kalimantan, West Kalimantan, Central Kalimantan and Riau, Bali, is the most prosperous Province, whereas the province's worst: East and West Nusa Tenggara, Bengkulu and Jambi. In General, provinces in eastern Indonesia occupying low position [29].

Base on the problems, then implementation of top-down policy model allows the implementation gaps parking various the impact. This was partly due for pattern approach centralistic developed central government had turned off initiative and creativity areas so that the administering government in the be ineffective [9],[26].Local governments were given less discretion to determine its own policies. The authority for this is given to the region accompanied by provision of adequate infrastructure, preparation of human resources professionals, and the allocation of a fair financing. As a result, happens rather than created the independence and effectiveness of local governance, but rather the local Government's reliance on the Central Government. Therefore, the policy implementation of rational top-down models which are uniform or implementation is no longer relevant to be applied.

### **2.3 Public Policy Implementation (Bottom-Up Models)**

The emergence of a bottom-up model is criticisms against model top-down which only achievement purpose oriented to effective without build a theoretical models or frame of analysis that can be used as a guide in the analysis of empirical [16]. A model top-down as first generation research that atheoretical, case-specific, and noncumulative, they cannot be used as the basis in the phenomena of more complex [8]. The process of implementing according to the bottom-up involving policy makers of parties involved in the implementation of policies. The implementation of the policy according to Smith does not run in a linear manner or mechanistic, but opening the probability of transactions through the negotiation process, or bargaining to produce a compromise against the implementation of the policy target group dimensional [20].

In line with the above policy model, Smith stated that there are four variables to note in the policy implementation process: (1) **Idealized policy**, that is an interaction pattern formulated by the framers of policy with the aim to encourage, influence and stimulate the target group to execute it; (2) **The target group**, part of the expected policy stakeholders can adopt patterns of interaction as hoped by the framers of policy; (3) **the implementing organization** is the implementing agencies or bureaucratic government units responsible for the implementation of the policy; (4) **Environmental factors** is the elements in the environment that affect the implementation of the policy (e.g., aspects of the socio-cultural, economic, and political). Four of these variables do not stand alone, but rather a single entity which interact and influence each other reciprocally, therefore often

cause pressure for the occurrence of a transaction or bargaining between actors in the formulation and implementation of policies..

Top-down models are widely criticized for not explaining the roles of the actors and other elements in the process of implementation. Policy makers should realize that policy is best implemented as backward mapping (mapping back) policy, the problem of defining success based on term human or human behavior, and therefore success is not just a fulfillment of a hypothesis [6].

Advanced mappings (forward mapping) or top-down models according to Elmore is nothing more than a myth that increasingly difficult maintained before the fact in the process of implementation. According to supporters of the bottom-up model, which is really important here is the relationship between policy makers and policy implementers. Bottom-up Model is an approach that sees the process as a negotiation and establishment of consensus. Bottom-up models emphasize the fact that the real implementation gave the leeway in the implementation of the policy

Those who are in the forefront of the implementation of policies with a level of having the scope of different choose rules in terms of what they would use to apply the policy. The implementation of the policy in bottom-up model, decentralization system applied over the endorsement of the law on no. 22/1999, as changes to the law on no. 5/1974 on local governments, which was subsequently revised into law no. 32/2004. Changes in policy is essentially constitute amendments of the paradigms of the implementation of local government of centralistic to decentralistic [27], [28].

This policy was set aside to guarantee the attainment of democratic Government, as well as efforts to reform the existing governance so that a Government can be closer to the local communities. Various assumptions of the experts that decentralization is one of the keys to overcoming the problem of development as the gap between the Central Government and local governments, the problem of poverty, and other issues. It is theoretically possible the policy of decentralization can say well, however in practice the concept of decentralization has not been fully implemented optimally and still tend to bring up matters that are not in want.

In connection with this matter, then the application of the implementation of a policy of bottom-up model in Indonesia based on the result of the study of Indonesian decentralization appraisal (RAPID, 2002 ) in addition to bringing positive impacts also bring negative impact. IRDA in the second report find much going on good practices (good practices) from management of development in the field of health, education, agriculture, the environment and investment [9], [26].

These findings are in line with the results of the Work of Robertson study (2002) in various countries, which among other things reported that decentralization brings the impact of increased health services in Belo Horizonte of Brazil; improved urban service at Sinuapa Honduras; Improvement of the quality of settlements in Pakistan; and improvement of health services in three cities in Philippines

However, the findings of Hadiz explained that decentralization in Indonesia brought an impact in the form of corruption cases being decentralized, a rule of being run by an official who predatory local officials spirited, and the spread of money politic for and gangster consolidated. Indonesian case is by hadiz is not unique. Many cases found in various countries who offers program democracy and decentralized with the main players the predators. The Post-soviet regime is the best example, besides the Philippines and Thailand.

From a variety of these problems, then the implementation of bottom-up model policy have not been effective. This is because the bottom-up model that gave the leeway in the implementation of policies in the area, resulting in the understanding of decentralization and regional autonomy in Indonesia vary widely. The regions generally gives a different interpretation of the system of decentralized and autonomous region, so the purpose of decentralization, such as; democratization, empowerment and well-being, is not reached

In Handbook Of governance and regional development (Bappenas, 2006), explained that from the aspect of democracy, which took place more emphasis on the rituals of democracy than the substance of democracy itself. Increasing the role of parliament as the legislative district more on the demands will be their rights as members of the Council such as the right to housing, financial rights, precedence and others compared to dealing with the substance of regional autonomy to create the people's welfare should be the basic tasks and their functions as representatives of the people.

In the interests of community empowerment, does not appear to be the transformation of the role of the community to be able to build group support and demands (supports and demands) to the Executive and legislative areas to establish a mechanism of mutual controls (checks and balances). From the point of creating prosperity, although there was some progress in many aspects, it should be recognized that during the implementation of regional autonomy, have not revealed any changes significantly over the quantity or the quality of public services organized by the local government

## **2.4 The Implementation of Policy ( *sintetis models* )**

Top-down and a bottom-up model for the implementation of public policy according to Lewis and Plyn (1978) tending to simplify the complexity of implementation. Hence, an alternative that is the most

appropriate on various situations. That is to synthesize the best features of the two approaches (is conducted synthesis against the characteristics of both the best approach) [33]. Implementation model of this synthesis, in many public policy implementation literature, also called integrative implementation model [8], [31]. They referred to it as the third generation of public policy implementation. This synthesis Model is a combination of a top-down model and bottom-up. This Model also shows that there is complementarity between the two models [33], because the top-down model focuses on the achievement of the objectives of a policy implementation, the bottom-up model while puts a focus on an implementation problem solving policy.

The idea to do a synthesis on the best traits of the top-down and bottom-up model contradicted by Gareth Morgan (1986), which States that if we want to understand the complexity, we must adopt a critical and creative approach to thinking in terms of a model or metaphor. From this point of view, the attempt to combine different models into a synthesis based on the strength of two different frameworks is misleading conduct. In developing his approach influenced by constructivist theory and postmodernism, Morgan stated that the analysis of complexity is not looking for a synthesis, but rather recognize the difference. According to Morgan no single metaphor can give the general theory. In terms of implementation, this means that the problem of implementation can be constructed in a way that is different. Each approach or theory gives some views on a particular dimension of the reality of implementation. However, Sabatier and Mazmanian stated that model synthesis it is possible to apply with hooking into the dynamics of the inter-organizational implementation in the form of networks between organization [33].

Network organization is a concept that developed enough in the literature theory of organization and management lately. The development of this concept triggered by environmental changes that are difficult to predict, so that when an organization wants to survive, are effective in achieving the objectives, and able to control important resources which it needs, then cooperation or partnerships with other organizations to become the main alternative in resolving various issues relating to it. In the process, other than in the theories of organization and management, intergovernmental organization network concept has also been used in the study of policy especially in the study of the implementation of the policy [16]. In the concept of the network between organizations, involvement of various organizations that have similar interests and objectives in linking the binder is an organization. Therefore, the relationships between organizations need to be designed in a network to ensure the passing mechanism function coordination in setting inter-organizational or multi institutions [18].

Its shape diverse, from which most cohesive as a community policy (policy communities) until the most barbarous its cohesion, such as issues network (issue by clarified networks) are unified by concern. The mechanism of a network of regulating and coordinating of sector policy more based on the preference the actors involved than consideration formulations public policy. In the process of policy, the interaction of built on the basis of inter dependency and runs through mechanism to exchange resources. Its implication is public policy in network model is nothing else the result of an exchange of information and preference, way and strategy, as well as an input-output purpose and resources done between actor. The consequence of network mechanism of public policy to be more determined by the interests of the actors concerned through the negotiation process. The relations of government with other actors has become relatively more equal, and the Government could no longer easily impose his interests.

In this context, although the mechanism of a network of devoted to manage public sector actors who are related, based on interests the government would remain are required to accountable to its people. The network is a form of the representation of interest that massif which is composed of people who has the capacity, so its very potential to become important element in the process of the implementation of the policy. However, the network constructed upon the alliance of interests among a group that may be threatened to the interests of the government. In the pressure of relations, the mechanism of this network having 's uniqueness typical.

## **2.4 The prospect of model application of organizational network implementation between organization in a system of decentralization of government of Indonesia.**

One of the big problems facing the government regions in developing its territory is limited resources important is needed. Regional government incapable of operate or making itself resources is needed. Even the vital resources is controlled more by institutions outside the local government. Hence, the prospect of the application of a model the implementation of tissue between organization in order to solve the decentralization system of government who are made of regional autonomy regional governments need to build or extending cooperation network or partnership, collaboration, and coordination with various institutions and other areas, the government in order to optimize the use of resources development.

1. Cooperation or partnership required to build executive leadership commitment especially local governments commitment in achievement of policy objectives. Executive leadership is important because of the effect on the achievement of the purpose of decentralized local governance as a whole, such as; democratization, empowerment and well-being. In addition to the commitment of the executive leadership, organizational networking model is also effectively implemented if the implementator has the commitment and the

- expertise of a professional in the execution of the policy of decentralization local governance
2. Collaboration become more important for the utilization of collaboration with resources (resources sharing). Collaboration of local government focused on the process of learn for themselves and development of network with the other party. In the future, the region need to learn and or mutual learn by regent / another town, vertical existing institutions like people, and other parties association of professional, universities and NGOs in accordance with their needs through a strategic partnerships opportunities on a sustainable basis in the form of public private partnership.
  3. Coordination can not be prevented so that similarity step in implementation decentralization policy government. Coordination in focus on institutional analysis structure composed of a series of actor and organization. For example, development programs in the can be seen as something implemented in bundles organization. A development program would involve many organizations: organization local and national, organization public, organization private business organizations, a labor organization, and others. Development program cannot be implemented by one the organization itself, but through matrix or series of a collection of organization.
  4. The implementation of network policy model between the organization was effectively implemented if institutions policy (local government ) are not required to do the reorganization consistently, as happened over the years since the policy of decentralizing applied it has been three times happened change design the organizational structure of a device region, namely; government regulation No 84 years 2000, Government Regulation No.8 / 2003, and Government Regulation no 41 / 2007 about regional apparatus organization
  5. The changes were bringing implication good against the organization, nomenclature organization, nor against authority the local government. In the context of capacity building that should be taken is development institution includes; development of the quality of public policy, development organization public, system development of public accountability culture and development organization
  6. Besides cooperation, collaboration, coordination, and reorganization consistently, two the government regulation as the implementation of the law on no. 32 / 2004, namely; (1) government regulation number 38 / 2007 about the division of affairs between the government, the provincial government, and governments of the city and (2) a government regulation number 41 / 2007 about regional apparatus organizations need to be reviewed.
  7. In government regulation number 38 / 2007 no longer known term authority of regional governance, but converted into government affairs region, because the authority having connotation with political is sovereignty, while affairs only at the administrative only (centralistic)
  8. This means, an province area, districts and towns, has no authority full in formulate and implement various policies and development programs its territory. Likewise with government regulation no 41 2007, that uniform organization regional type and nomenclature. One mark of centralistic according rational top-down model is spatially uniform or uniform. Hence, need mapping passage back decentralized after act No. 32 / 2004.

### References

- [1] A. Anderson, J. E. 1979. *Public Policy Making*. NY: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- [2] Cheema, G. Shabbir and Dennis Rondinelli (ed), 1983. *Decentralization and Development: Policy Implementation in Developing Countries*. *Beverly Hills* : Sage Publications.
- [3] Dunsire Andrew, 1978. *Implementation in Bureaucracy*. Martin Robertson, Oxford.
- [4] Dye, Thomas R. 2002. *Understanding Public Policy*. Tenth Edition, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- [5] Dwiyanto, Agus. 2003. *Governance reform and Regional Autonomy*, PSKK-UGM, Partnership of PEG-USAID. *World Bank*. Yogyakarta.
- [6] Elmore, R. 1985. *Forward and Bacward Mappingin K. Hanf and T. Toonen (eds), Policy Implementation in Federal and Unitary System*. Marrtinus,Nijhof, Dorderecht, Holland.
- [7] Eston David. 1953. *The Polical System*. Alfred A. Knopf, New York.
- [8] Goggin, Malcolm L. et.al. 1990. *Implementation Theory and Practice, Toward a Third Generation*. USA: Scott, Foresman and Company.
- [9] Hadi, Astar. 2007. *Membaca Michael Howlett: Menuju Implementasi Kebijakan Sosial Posmodern*, <http://astarhadi.blog.friendster.com>, diakses 07 Januari 2009.
- [10] Haclo. H. 1972. Review Article: *Policy Analysis*. *British Journal of Political Science*, 2:83-108.
- [11] Howlett, Michael & Ramesh, M. 2003. *Studying Public Policy, Policy Cycles and Policy Subsystems*. (2<sup>nd</sup> edition). Canada: Oxford University Press.
- [12] Hudson, John, and Lowe, Stuart. 2004. *Understanding the Policy Process, Analyzing Welfare Policy and Practice*. UK: *The Policy Press and the Social Policy Association*.
- [13] Laswell, H.D. 1970. *The Emerging Conception of the Policy Sciences*. *Policy Sciences*. Macmillan, Free Press, New York.
- [14] LindblomCarles. 1959. *The Science of Muddling Through*, *Public Administration Review*.
- [15] Nugroho D. Raiant. 2004. *KebijakanPublik. Formulasi, ImplementasidanEvaluasi*. Gramedia. Jakarta.
- [16] O'Toole, Jr., Laurence J. 2003. *Interorganizational Relations in Implementationin Peters, B Guy & Pierre, Jon. 2003. Handbook of Public Administration*. London: Sage Publications Ltd
- [17] Parsons, Wayne. 1997. *Public Policy: An introduction to the theory and practice of policy analysis*, Edward Elgar Publishing, Inc. Cambridge.

- [18] Pratikno. 2007. Governance dan Krisis Teori Organisasi. *Jurnal Administrasi Kebijakan Publik*, November 2007, Vol. 12, No. 2, Yogyakarta: MAP UGM.
- [19] Presman, Jeffrey L. & Wildavsky, Aaron. 1984. *Implementation*. (3<sup>rd</sup> Edition, expanded). USA: University of California Press, Ltd.
- [20] Putra, Fadillah. 2003. *Paradigma Kritis Dalam Studi Kebijakan Publik: Perubahan dan Inovasi Kebijakan Publik dan Ruang Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Proses Kebijakan Publik*, Pustaka Pelajar, Yogyakarta.
- [21] Robbins, Stephen P dan Neil Barnwell. 2002. *Organization Theory: Concepts and Cases*, fourth edition, Prentice Hall, Australia.
- [22] Rondinelli, Dennis, 1999. "What is Decentralization?" dalam Jennie Litvack and Jessica Seddon (ed.), *Decentralization Briefing Notes*. World Bank Institute. Dapat dilihat di <http://www.worldbank.org/wbi/publications/wbi37142.pdf>
- [23] Simon Herbert. 1945. *Administrative Behavior*. Free Press, New York.
- [24] Smith, Briant C. 1985. *Decentralization: the Territorial Dimension of the State*. London: George Allen dan Unwin.
- [25] Tri Widodo, W.U. 2004, *Trend Desentralisasi dalam Administrasi Publik (Sebuah Kajian Terhadap Dampak Desentralisasi Dalam Perspektif Internasional dan Pengalaman Indonesia)*, dalam *Jurnal Manajemen Pembangunan*, No. 47/III/Tahun XIII, hal. 9-19, Jakarta: LAN (ISSN 1829-8974).
- [26] Utomo, Budi. 2007. Desentralisasi dan Efektivitas Tata Pemerintahan. <http://budiutomo79.blogspot.com/2007/10/desentralisasi>, diakses 18 Maret 2009.
- [27] Undang-Undang Nomor 22 Tahun 1999 Tentang Pemerintahan Daerah. Sinar Grafika, Jakarta.
- [28] Undang-Undang Nomor 32 Tahun 2004 Tentang Pemerintahan Daerah. Pustaka Pergaulan, Jakarta.
- [29] Waluyo, Joko. 2007. Dampak Desentralisasi Fiskal Terhadap Pertumbuhan Ekonomi dan Ketimpangan Pendapatan Antardaerah Di Indonesia. [www.theceli.com](http://www.theceli.com)... diakses 18 Maret 2009.
- [30] Winarno, Budi. 2008. *Kebijakan Publik: Teori dan Proses*, Cetakan Kedua Edisi Revisi, Media Pressindo, Yogyakarta.
- [31] Winter, Soren C. 2003. *Implementation Perspectives: Status and Reconsideration*. Dalam Peters, B Guy & Pierre, Jon. 2003. *Handbook of Public Administration*. London: Sage Publications Ltd
- [32] Weber, Max. 1946. *Bureaucracy*, From Max Weber, Hans Gerth and C. Wright Mills (eds), Oxford University, Press, New York, NY
- [33] Sabatier, Paul; Mazmanian, Daniel. 1979. *The Implementation of Public Policy; A Framework of Analysis*. Institute of Government Affairs.