Corpus: International Journal of Law and Political Authority

Vol 1 No 2 April 2026, Hal 27-42

ISSN: XXXX-XXXX (Print) ISSN: XXXX-XXXX (Electronic)

Open Access: https://researchfrontiers.id/corpus

Decentralization and Public Accountability: Evaluating Legal Frameworks of Local Governance Performance in Southeast Asia

Aswanto[1*], Teddy Delano[2], Azka Syifaul Maula[3]

[1] Institut Teknologi dan Bisnis Master, Indonesia

[2] Universitas Kristen Satya Wacana, Indonesia

[3] UIN Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta, Indonesia

email: aswantoo@gmail.com[1]

Article Info :

Received:
15-03-2026

Revised:
10-04-2026

Accepted:
13-04-2026

Abstract

This study examines the relationship between decentralization and public accountability through an empirical normative legal analysis of local governance frameworks in Southeast Asia. The research integrates doctrinal legal interpretation with comparative governance evaluation in order to assess the effectiveness of constitutional regulation fiscal decentralization and digital governance within decentralized administrative systems. Primary legal materials consist of constitutional provisions regional governance statutes judicial decisions and ASEAN institutional instruments while empirical evidence is derived from Worldwide Governance Indicators transparency reports and official governmental publications concerning local governance performance. The findings demonstrate that decentralization strengthens democratic participation and regional administrative flexibility although fragmented regulatory structures uneven institutional capacity and inconsistent fiscal supervision continue to weaken accountability performance across local governments. Fiscal decentralization contributes to regional economic development and governmental responsiveness yet simultaneously increases corruption risks budgetary opacity and supervisory complexity within multilevel governance systems. The study further identifies that digital governance transformation and hybrid administrative coordination require adaptive legal frameworks capable of integrating transparency institutional supervision and technological accountability in order to preserve democratic legitimacy and effective public administration within Southeast Asian decentralized governance systems.

Keywords : *Decentralization, Public Accountability, Local Governance, Fiscal Governance, Digital Governance.*

INTRODUCTION

The contemporary expansion of decentralization across Southeast Asia has transformed local governance from a merely administrative extension of the central state into a complex arena of legal authority, fiscal autonomy, and public accountability, particularly as governments confront intensifying demands for transparency, participatory governance, and institutional responsiveness within rapidly digitized public sectors and increasingly fragmented political environments. Comparative governance discourse has progressively shifted from measuring decentralization solely through administrative devolution toward evaluating the extent to which local legal frameworks are capable of ensuring accountable governance performance, especially in developing democracies where local autonomy frequently coexists with persistent patronage networks and uneven institutional capacity. Within this evolving context, Southeast Asian states have adopted diverse regulatory models aimed at strengthening local accountability mechanisms through public information disclosure, fiscal restructuring, and service delivery reform, as reflected in Indonesia's constitutional recognition of regional autonomy under the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia and subsequent statutory developments concerning public information disclosure, public services, regional governance, and intergovernmental fiscal relations (Government of Indonesia, 1945; Government of Indonesia, 2008; Government of Indonesia, 2009; Government of Indonesia, 2014; Government of Indonesia, 2022). Simultaneously, global governance indicators continue to reveal that decentralization does not automatically correlate with higher institutional integrity or administrative effectiveness, since governance quality across Southeast Asia remains characterized by fluctuating regulatory performance, inconsistent rule of law implementation, and persistent corruption vulnerabilities despite extensive decentralization reforms (World Bank, 2025; Transparency International, 2024).

Existing scholarship has generated substantial debate regarding the relationship between decentralization and public accountability, particularly concerning whether devolved authority enhances democratic responsiveness or instead reproduces governance fragmentation at the subnational level. Several empirical studies demonstrate that decentralization may strengthen local innovation, improve policy adaptation, and stimulate institutional responsiveness when accompanied by coherent regulatory governance and effective administrative coordination. Research examining local government asset governance in Indonesia, for example, illustrates that regional autonomy can encourage policy experimentation and improve governance planning mechanisms, although institutional effectiveness remains heavily dependent upon the quality of regulatory oversight and bureaucratic professionalism (Sumaryana et al., 2024). Parallel studies focusing on regulatory governance and investment performance further suggest that decentralized governance systems are capable of facilitating regional economic growth when local legal institutions possess sufficient regulatory clarity and administrative predictability (Yuwono et al., 2025). At the same time, emerging analyses concerning artificial intelligence governance within decentralized political systems reveal that technological modernization frequently intensifies coordination dilemmas between central and regional authorities, thereby exposing structural tensions between policy innovation and accountability harmonization in multi level governance systems (Wadipalapa et al., 2024). Comparative findings from outside Southeast Asia also reinforce these debates by demonstrating that legislative decentralization may produce regulatory dilution and weaken enforcement consistency when local governments prioritize political or economic interests over broader public accountability objectives (Zhang et al., 2025).

Despite the growing sophistication of decentralization studies, important conceptual and empirical limitations continue to constrain the literature, particularly regarding the legal evaluation of governance performance within Southeast Asian local administrations. Much of the existing research remains divided between normative legal analysis that focuses predominantly on statutory architecture and empirical governance studies that prioritize quantitative indicators without sufficiently interrogating the legal structures underlying institutional performance. As a consequence, decentralization is often treated either as a constitutional principle detached from measurable accountability outcomes or as a technocratic governance variable isolated from its juridical foundations. This fragmentation becomes particularly problematic in Southeast Asia, where local governance operates within highly diverse constitutional arrangements, uneven bureaucratic capacities, and politically contingent enforcement practices that cannot be adequately explained through single disciplinary approaches. Existing studies also tend to privilege national case studies while neglecting comparative regional analysis capable of identifying broader patterns of accountability convergence and divergence across ASEAN governance systems. Even when governance indicators such as regulatory quality, control of corruption, or government effectiveness are incorporated into decentralization analysis, scholars frequently fail to connect these measurements to the operational realities of local legal frameworks governing transparency, fiscal accountability, and public service obligations (World Bank, 2025; Transparency International, 2024).

The unresolved relationship between decentralization and public accountability possesses significant scientific and practical urgency because ineffective local governance increasingly generates multidimensional consequences extending beyond administrative inefficiency toward democratic erosion, fiscal instability, and declining public trust in state institutions. Contemporary governance challenges in Southeast Asia, including uneven public service delivery, corruption within regional administrations, weak intergovernmental coordination, and inconsistent regulatory enforcement, demonstrate that decentralization without robust accountability frameworks may intensify institutional disparities rather than strengthen democratic governance. The urgency of this issue becomes more pronounced as regional governments assume expanded responsibilities in fiscal management, digital governance, environmental regulation, and social welfare administration while operating under varying degrees of legal oversight and political supervision. Indonesia's evolving decentralization regime, particularly through legislation concerning public information disclosure, regional government authority, public service obligations, and fiscal relations between central and regional governments, illustrates the complexity of balancing local autonomy with national accountability standards in rapidly transforming governance systems (Government of Indonesia, 2008; Government of Indonesia, 2009;

Government of Indonesia, 2014; Government of Indonesia, 2022). Simultaneously, declining public confidence associated with corruption perceptions and governance inconsistencies across numerous Southeast Asian jurisdictions underscores the necessity of reexamining whether current decentralization frameworks genuinely strengthen accountable governance or merely redistribute administrative power without effective legal control mechanisms (Transparency International, 2024).

This research positions itself within the intersection of decentralization law, governance studies, and comparative public accountability by advancing an empirically informed normative evaluation of local governance performance across Southeast Asia. Unlike prior studies that either isolate doctrinal legal analysis from governance measurement or narrowly examine single country administrative reforms, this study integrates regional regulatory frameworks, governance indicators, and institutional performance analysis into a unified analytical model capable of examining how legal structures shape accountability outcomes under decentralized governance arrangements. The research critically engages with contemporary debates concerning governance fragmentation, regulatory coherence, and institutional adaptation by treating decentralization not merely as administrative devolution but as a legally mediated system of public accountability whose effectiveness depends upon the interaction between statutory design, institutional implementation, and governance performance indicators. In doing so, the study extends previous scholarship on decentralized governance innovation, regulatory governance systems, and accountability tensions within evolving Southeast Asian governance architectures while also incorporating comparative insights regarding the risks of regulatory dilution and institutional inconsistency in decentralized legal systems (Sumaryana et al., 2024; Wadipalapa et al., 2024; Yuwono et al., 2025; Zhang et al., 2025).

This study aims to evaluate the effectiveness of legal frameworks governing decentralization and public accountability in Southeast Asian local governance systems through an empirical normative approach that combines analysis of regional regulations, governance performance indicators, and official ASEAN governmental reports. The research seeks to construct a comparative legal governance framework capable of explaining how variations in decentralization design influence accountability performance across local administrations while simultaneously identifying structural conditions that either strengthen or weaken institutional transparency, regulatory consistency, and public service responsiveness. The theoretical contribution of this study lies in the development of an integrated approach linking decentralization law with governance performance evaluation, while its methodological contribution emerges from the synthesis of normative legal analysis and comparative empirical governance assessment within a cross regional Southeast Asian context.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study constitutes an empirical normative legal research design integrating doctrinal legal examination with comparative governance analysis in order to evaluate the effectiveness of decentralization and public accountability frameworks within Southeast Asian local governance systems. The research employs primary legal materials consisting of constitutional provisions, decentralization statutes, regional governance regulations, judicial decisions, and ASEAN institutional instruments, including the ASEAN Charter, ASEAN Community Vision 2025, and Decision Number 56/PUU XIV/2016 of the Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia concerning regional governmental authority and constitutional interpretation of decentralization principles (Association of Southeast Asian Nations, 2007; ASEAN Secretariat, 2020; Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2016). Secondary materials include scholarly works on decentralization, administrative law, and governance theory, particularly concerning democratic accountability and regional administrative authority (Faguet, 2012; Hadjon, 2011). Empirical data were derived from the Worldwide Governance Indicators issued by the World Bank and official governmental reports concerning local governance performance across Southeast Asian jurisdictions (World Bank, 2025). Data collection was conducted through systematic document analysis, regulatory mapping, and comparative examination of governance indicators associated with regulatory quality, government effectiveness, rule of law, and control of corruption within decentralized administrative structures.

The analytical framework applies qualitative juridical analysis combined with comparative governance evaluation in order to examine the relationship between decentralization norms and measurable accountability performance. Legal interpretation was conducted through statutory, conceptual, and comparative approaches aimed at identifying the coherence, consistency, and institutional implications of decentralization regulations within Southeast Asian governance systems. Governance indicators were analytically correlated with regional legal frameworks to evaluate whether variations in decentralization design correspond with differences in institutional accountability and administrative performance. The study further employs an interpretative approach grounded in democratic decentralization theory and administrative law principles in order to assess the extent to which local autonomy aligns with constitutional accountability obligations and regional governance standards. Analytical validity was strengthened through triangulation between legal documents, governance datasets, judicial interpretations, and ASEAN governmental reports to ensure conceptual consistency and empirical reliability in evaluating the interaction between decentralization and public accountability across Southeast Asia.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Constitutional Construction of Decentralization and Public Accountability in Southeast Asian Local Governance Systems

The constitutional architecture of decentralization in Southeast Asia demonstrates that local governance authority is not merely an administrative delegation mechanism but a juridical redistribution of state power requiring explicit accountability guarantees embedded within constitutional and statutory structures. Article 18 of the Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia recognizes regional autonomy as a constitutional mandate linked to democratic participation and effective public administration through decentralized governance arrangements established by legislation and administrative supervision mechanisms (Government of Indonesia, 1945). Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government further institutionalizes the distribution of governmental affairs between central and regional authorities through concurrent functions that allocate responsibility according to externality accountability and efficiency principles under Articles 9 and 11 of the statute (Government of Indonesia, 2014). Constitutional Court Decision Number 56 PUU XIV 2016 reinforced the constitutional interpretation that decentralization remains inseparable from the unitary state doctrine and public welfare objectives because regional autonomy cannot eliminate central supervisory competence over local governmental performance and budgetary responsibility (Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia, 2016). The doctrinal interpretation advanced by Hadjon emphasizes that administrative legality within decentralized governance requires institutional accountability mechanisms capable of controlling discretionary authority and ensuring legal certainty in public administration processes conducted by local governments (Hadjon, 2011).

The relationship between decentralization and democratic accountability has generated competing interpretations within comparative public law scholarship because decentralization may simultaneously strengthen citizen participation while also creating fragmented regulatory authority across subnational institutions. Faguet explains that decentralization functions effectively only when local political structures possess institutional incentives encouraging responsiveness transparency and legal accountability toward community interests rather than elite consolidation (Faguet, 2012). Empirical studies concerning local governance performance in the Philippines indicate that decentralization reforms improved public service responsiveness in municipalities possessing stronger participatory oversight and administrative professionalism while weaker institutional regions experienced inconsistent accountability enforcement and reduced policy coherence (Cruz, 2024). Hidayat Hospes and Termeer identify that Indonesian decentralization produced mixed democratic outcomes because legal decentralization evolved more rapidly than institutional capacity resulting in uneven implementation of accountability obligations across regions (Hidayat et al., 2025). Comparative findings from Nepal also demonstrate that local autonomy without sufficient legal supervision and administrative resources creates structural limitations in community service provision because regional governments frequently encounter fiscal constraints and bureaucratic fragmentation that weaken public accountability mechanisms (Acharya & Scott, 2022).

The legal framework governing transparency obligations constitutes a central component of accountability within decentralized governance because local autonomy cannot operate legitimately without enforceable public information rights and institutional openness standards. Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure established mandatory transparency obligations for regional governments through Article 7 paragraph 1 which requires public agencies to provide accurate information concerning governmental decision making budget allocation and public policy implementation processes (Government of Indonesia, 2008). Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services also codifies citizen rights to accountable and non discriminatory administrative services through service standards complaint procedures and participatory oversight obligations binding local administrative institutions under Articles 15 and 18 of the statute (Government of Indonesia, 2009). Research examining transparency and accountability within regional financial reporting systems confirms that digitalization reforms enhanced public accessibility to governmental information although legal enforcement mechanisms remain inconsistent because local compliance depends heavily upon bureaucratic commitment and technological capacity (Parindingan et al., 2024). Antoni Rahayu and Lestari further demonstrate that electronic governance mechanisms significantly mediate the relationship between financial accountability and institutional trust because digital administration strengthens traceability monitoring and transparency within decentralized fiscal systems (Antoni et al., 2026).

Fiscal decentralization constitutes one of the most contested dimensions of regional governance because financial autonomy directly affects the capacity of local governments to fulfill constitutional obligations concerning welfare public services and regional development. Law Number 1 of 2022 concerning Fiscal Relations between the Central Government and Regional Governments restructures fiscal distribution mechanisms through tax assignment transfer allocation and regional expenditure obligations intended to strengthen accountability and fiscal sustainability across decentralized administrations (Government of Indonesia, 2022). Lewis argues that the new fiscal decentralization framework reflects an attempt to recalibrate the balance between local discretion and central fiscal oversight because prior arrangements generated disparities in financial capacity and accountability effectiveness among regional governments (Lewis, 2023). Empirical evidence from Vietnam indicates that fiscal decentralization generates positive spillover effects on governance quality when local fiscal authority is supported by coherent institutional coordination and transparent budget administration mechanisms that reduce administrative fragmentation (Dinh Thanh et al., 2023). Studies concerning district level economic growth in Indonesia also reveal that regional own source revenue positively influences local economic performance when accompanied by accountable governance structures and effective regulatory management systems capable of ensuring budgetary integrity and policy consistency (Fauji & Syafitri, 2024).

The interaction between administrative law principles and local budget governance demonstrates that decentralization requires legally structured financial supervision capable of preventing abuse of discretionary authority within regional administrations. Administrative law doctrine emphasizes that governmental authority exercised through budget allocation and public expenditure decisions must remain subject to legality proportionality and accountability principles protecting citizens from arbitrary administrative conduct (Hadjon, 2011). Fitria Nuriyatman Amir and Saraya identify that inefficiencies within local budgeting systems frequently originate from procedural inconsistencies overlapping regulatory authority and weak legal supervision mechanisms affecting regional expenditure implementation (Fitria et al., 2025). Islam further explains that transparent budgeting systems in developing economies depend upon institutionalized oversight instruments including participatory budgeting audit integration and accessible fiscal reporting capable of ensuring substantive public accountability rather than formalistic administrative compliance alone (Islam, 2025). Hummel and Kusumasari demonstrate that decentralization contributes positively to financial performance only when local governments possess adequate fiscal management capacity supported by legally enforceable accountability standards and effective monitoring institutions preventing budgetary distortions and corruption risks (Hummel & Kusumasari, 2025).

Table 1. Comparative Normative Frameworks of Decentralization and Public Accountability in Southeast Asia

Legal Instrument	Accountability Norm	Juridical Function	Governance Implication
Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia Article 18	Regional autonomy under unitary state principle	Constitutional delegation of authority	Legal basis for decentralized governance

Law Number 14 of 2008 Article 7	Public information disclosure obligation	Transparency guarantee	Public access to governmental information
Law Number 25 of 2009 Articles 15 and 18	Public service accountability	Citizen protection mechanism	Administrative responsiveness
Law Number 23 of 2014 Articles 9 and 11	Distribution of governmental affairs	Administrative coordination	Regional authority supervision
Law Number 1 of 2022	Fiscal decentralization regulation	Budgetary accountability	Fiscal sustainability and oversight
Constitutional Court Decision 56 PUU XIV 2016	Constitutional limitation of local autonomy	Judicial interpretation of decentralization	Preservation of unitary governance coherence

Source: Processed from Government of Indonesia 1945 Government of Indonesia 2008 Government of Indonesia 2009 Government of Indonesia 2014 Government of Indonesia 2022 and Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia 2016.

The normative comparison presented in Table 1 demonstrates that Southeast Asian decentralization frameworks increasingly integrate accountability obligations within constitutional and statutory arrangements although significant differences remain concerning supervisory intensity and legal enforcement mechanisms. The Indonesian framework reflects a hybrid decentralization model combining regional autonomy with centralized constitutional supervision intended to preserve administrative coherence within the unitary state structure. ASEAN institutional instruments such as the ASEAN Charter and ASEAN Community Vision 2025 also encourage principles of good governance transparency and institutional cooperation although these instruments operate primarily through soft law coordination rather than binding supranational enforcement mechanisms (Association of Southeast Asian Nations, 2007 ASEAN Secretariat, 2020). Comparative analysis with Thailand indicates that partial fiscal recentralization has been utilized as a corrective mechanism aimed at strengthening local governmental capacity and reducing institutional fragmentation produced by excessive regional discretion without adequate accountability control structures (Gilley & Laochankham, 2024). The doctrinal implication emerging from this comparative framework suggests that decentralization cannot be interpreted exclusively through autonomy expansion because accountability obligations constitute an inseparable constitutional condition limiting regional governmental authority within democratic legal systems.

Regional governance performance indicators further reveal that constitutional decentralization does not automatically ensure effective accountability because institutional implementation remains dependent upon administrative culture bureaucratic professionalism and regulatory coordination. World Bank governance indicators demonstrate significant disparities across Southeast Asian jurisdictions concerning rule of law government effectiveness and control of corruption despite the widespread adoption of decentralization reforms and local autonomy policies (World Bank, 2025). Transparency International data similarly indicates that corruption vulnerabilities remain structurally embedded within several decentralized governance systems because local administrative discretion frequently exceeds available supervisory and enforcement mechanisms capable of ensuring accountability compliance (Transparency International, 2024). El Kezazy and Hilmi explain that management control systems within local authorities constitute essential accountability instruments because decentralized administrations require internal governance mechanisms capable of monitoring financial integrity procedural legality and policy implementation effectiveness (El Kezazy & Hilmi, 2023). Ortega and Acero further identify that organizational culture and political dynamics within local governmental institutions significantly affect administrative performance because accountability structures are shaped not only by formal legal norms but also by institutional behavior and bureaucratic incentives influencing public administration practices (Ortega & Acero, 2025).

The development of digital governance systems has transformed the legal dimensions of decentralization because public accountability increasingly depends upon technological transparency data governance and electronic administrative coordination mechanisms. Wadipalapa and colleagues explain that Indonesia’s decentralized artificial intelligence governance policy illustrates the tension between technological innovation and institutional harmonization because regional governments possess varying capacities in implementing digital accountability systems within fragmented administrative environments (Wadipalapa et al., 2024). Administrative digitalization also intensifies questions concerning jurisdictional authority data supervision and legal responsibility because decentralized governance structures frequently lack uniform regulatory standards governing algorithmic decision making and digital public administration procedures. Research concerning public private partnerships in Thailand demonstrates that collaborative governance arrangements may enhance regional administrative efficiency although legal accountability becomes more complex when public functions are distributed across governmental and private institutional actors operating through contractual arrangements (Laochankham et al., 2024). Comparative interpretation of these developments suggests that decentralization law must evolve beyond territorial administrative allocation toward integrated accountability frameworks capable of regulating digital governance and hybrid institutional cooperation within contemporary public administration systems.

The constitutional and statutory evolution of decentralization within Southeast Asia ultimately reflects an ongoing juridical struggle to reconcile regional autonomy democratic participation and centralized accountability within increasingly complex governance environments. Comparative legal analysis indicates that decentralization reforms producing stronger accountability outcomes are characterized by coherent legal supervision transparent fiscal regulation enforceable public participation rights and institutionalized oversight mechanisms integrating administrative legality with democratic responsiveness. Juridical interpretation of Indonesian decentralization statutes demonstrates that regional autonomy operates as a conditional constitutional competence constrained by accountability obligations embedded within administrative law fiscal governance and public service regulation structures. Comparative empirical findings across Southeast Asia confirm that governance performance improves when decentralization is accompanied by effective legal coordination transparent budgeting systems and institutional mechanisms capable of limiting discretionary abuse within local administrations. The legal significance of these findings lies in the recognition that decentralization constitutes not merely a governance technique but a constitutional accountability framework requiring continuous normative adaptation in response to evolving administrative technological and democratic challenges within Southeast Asian governance systems.

Fiscal Decentralization and Institutional Accountability within Southeast Asian Local Governance Systems

Fiscal decentralization within Southeast Asian governance systems has evolved into a central legal instrument for redistributing administrative responsibility and strengthening local governmental performance through expanded regional financial authority and institutional accountability mechanisms. Law Number 1 of 2022 concerning Fiscal Relations between the Central Government and Regional Governments introduced a revised fiscal architecture designed to regulate regional revenue allocation intergovernmental transfers and local expenditure responsibilities through legally structured fiscal coordination mechanisms intended to reduce disparities among subnational administrations (Government of Indonesia, 2022). The statutory formulation contained in Article 2 and Article 5 of the legislation demonstrates that fiscal decentralization is interpreted not merely as budgetary delegation but as an accountability regime requiring transparency efficiency and measurable public welfare outcomes within local financial governance structures. Lewis argues that the revised fiscal decentralization framework in Indonesia reflects an attempt to overcome structural weaknesses generated by earlier decentralization models that distributed expenditure responsibilities without equivalent institutional supervision and fiscal equalization instruments capable of ensuring accountability coherence among regional governments (Lewis, 2023). Comparative governance analysis further indicates that fiscal decentralization systems operating without strong supervisory mechanisms frequently produce legal uncertainty administrative inconsistency and unequal development outcomes because local financial discretion may exceed institutional oversight capacity within decentralized governance arrangements (World Bank, 2025).

Empirical governance indicators demonstrate that variations in local governmental performance across Southeast Asia are strongly influenced by the relationship between fiscal decentralization and regulatory quality because financial autonomy frequently affects administrative effectiveness institutional transparency and corruption control mechanisms. The Worldwide Governance Indicators reveal that jurisdictions possessing more coherent fiscal supervision and transparent budget allocation systems generally achieve higher government effectiveness and regulatory quality scores than regions characterized by fragmented fiscal management and weak accountability enforcement structures (World Bank, 2025). Hummel and Kusumasari identify that local government financial performance in Indonesia improves when decentralization is supported by institutional accountability systems integrating budget planning expenditure supervision and measurable performance evaluation within regional administrations (Hummel & Kusumasari, 2025). Research conducted by Mohammed Tuokuu and Bokuma concerning decentralization in Ghana similarly demonstrates that regional governmental effectiveness depends significantly upon the legal clarity of fiscal authority distribution and the existence of monitoring mechanisms capable of controlling misuse of public resources within local administrative systems (Mohammed et al., 2025). Comparative interpretation of these findings suggests that fiscal decentralization operates effectively only when positive law structures fiscal discretion within enforceable accountability frameworks linking budgetary authority to institutional responsibility and public oversight obligations.

The juridical relationship between fiscal decentralization and administrative efficiency reflects broader debates concerning the legal limits of regional financial autonomy within decentralized governance systems. Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government establishes that local administrations possess authority over regional expenditure management public service financing and development planning subject to supervisory evaluation conducted through ministerial and intergovernmental oversight mechanisms under Articles 373 and 374 of the statute (Government of Indonesia, 2014). Administrative law doctrine articulated by Hadjon emphasizes that discretionary financial authority exercised by regional governments remains bound by legality proportionality and accountability principles requiring public officials to justify fiscal decisions through transparent administrative procedures and measurable governance outcomes (Hadjon, 2011). Fitria Nuriyatman Amir and Saraya demonstrate that inefficiencies in local budgeting systems frequently emerge from overlapping regulatory authority inconsistent planning mechanisms and procedural weaknesses within administrative supervision structures governing regional financial management (Fitria et al., 2025). Islam further explains that transparent budgeting systems in developing governance environments require integrated oversight institutions participatory budget monitoring and accessible financial reporting mechanisms capable of transforming fiscal administration into a legally accountable public governance process rather than a purely bureaucratic expenditure exercise (Islam, 2025).

The regulation of regional own source revenue constitutes a critical aspect of decentralization law because local fiscal capacity directly determines the ability of regional governments to fulfill public service obligations and developmental responsibilities under decentralized governance structures. Law Number 1 of 2022 authorizes regional governments to collect taxes levies and locally generated revenue under statutory limitations intended to preserve fiscal accountability and prevent excessive financial disparities between subnational jurisdictions (Government of Indonesia, 2022). Fauji and Syafitri identify that regional own source revenue positively affects district level economic growth when local administrations possess accountable governance structures capable of managing revenue allocation through efficient regulatory systems and transparent budget implementation mechanisms (Fauji & Syafitri, 2024). Empirical governance data also reveals that regions with stronger locally generated revenue bases tend to exhibit higher administrative responsiveness and greater flexibility in financing public infrastructure and social services although corruption risks increase when supervisory institutions remain weak or politically compromised (Transparency International, 2024). Comparative analysis demonstrates that the legal challenge of fiscal decentralization lies not in expanding local revenue authority alone but in constructing regulatory safeguards capable of ensuring that regional financial autonomy remains consistent with accountability obligations and equitable governance principles across decentralized administrative systems.

The institutional supervision of regional financial management increasingly depends upon the integration of digital governance systems capable of strengthening budget transparency administrative monitoring and public participation within decentralized governance structures. Antoni Rahayu and Lestari explain that electronic governance significantly mediates local governmental financial accountability because digital financial systems improve traceability reporting accuracy and institutional responsiveness within regional administrative environments characterized by complex expenditure processes and fragmented supervision mechanisms (Antoni et al., 2026). Parindingan

Haliah and Nirwana similarly identify that digitalized financial reporting systems enhance transparency and public accessibility to regional fiscal information although legal compliance and technological capacity remain uneven among local administrations operating under decentralized governance frameworks (Parindingan et al., 2024). Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure reinforces these developments through Article 9 which obligates public institutions including regional governments to provide periodic information concerning budget realization and public expenditure administration as part of legally enforceable transparency obligations (Government of Indonesia, 2008). Empirical interpretation of governance indicators demonstrates that regions adopting integrated digital fiscal governance systems generally exhibit stronger institutional accountability and lower corruption vulnerability because technological transparency reduces opportunities for discretionary manipulation within public financial administration processes (World Bank, 2025).

Table 2. Comparative Governance Indicators and Fiscal Accountability in Selected Southeast Asian Decentralization Systems

Country	Government Effectiveness Trend	Regulatory Quality Trend	Fiscal Decentralization Characteristics	Corruption Control Trend	Accountability Implication
Indonesia	Moderate improvement	Moderate improvement	Extensive regional expenditure authority	Persistent regional corruption risk	Requires stronger supervisory integration
Thailand	Stable administrative performance	Moderate regulatory consistency	Partial fiscal recentralization	Moderate corruption control	Central oversight strengthens coordination
Philippines	Uneven local governance performance	Fragmented regulatory implementation	Strong municipal autonomy	High local political influence	Accountability varies across regions
Vietnam	Increasing governance effectiveness	Strong fiscal coordination	Controlled fiscal decentralization	Relatively stable oversight	Coordinated decentralization improves efficiency

Source: Processed from World Bank Worldwide Governance Indicators 2025 Transparency International Corruption Perceptions Index 2024 Lewis 2023 Gilley and Laochankham 2024 and Dinh Thanh et al. 2023.

The comparative governance trends presented in Table 2 demonstrate that fiscal decentralization generates different accountability outcomes depending upon the coherence of legal supervision institutional coordination and corruption control mechanisms operating within regional governance systems. Indonesia exhibits extensive regional expenditure authority accompanied by persistent corruption risks at the local level indicating that fiscal autonomy without sufficiently integrated oversight mechanisms may weaken accountability consistency despite expanded democratic participation structures. Thailand presents a contrasting model in which partial fiscal recentralization has strengthened administrative coordination and regulatory coherence through increased central oversight of local governmental finance and institutional performance evaluation mechanisms (Gilley & Laochankham, 2024). Vietnam demonstrates that controlled decentralization supported by coordinated fiscal supervision may improve governance effectiveness and public administration quality because regional financial authority remains integrated within centralized monitoring systems capable of preserving institutional consistency and policy coherence (Dinh Thanh et al., 2023). Comparative legal interpretation of these governance patterns indicates that fiscal decentralization should be understood as a conditional administrative arrangement whose legitimacy depends upon the existence of enforceable accountability structures regulating the exercise of local financial discretion within decentralized governance systems.

The relationship between fiscal governance and investment regulation further illustrates that decentralization law affects not only administrative accountability but also economic development and institutional competitiveness within regional governance systems. Yuwono Wiryawan and Yuzuru explain that regulatory governance quality significantly influences investment growth in decentralized Indonesia because regional governments possessing coherent administrative procedures and transparent licensing systems create more predictable legal environments for economic activity and institutional development (Yuwono et al., 2025). Empirical findings indicate that local governments characterized by weak fiscal accountability and inconsistent regulatory enforcement frequently experience reduced investor confidence because administrative uncertainty and corruption risks undermine legal certainty within decentralized governance environments. El Kezazy and Hilmi argue that management control systems within local authorities operate as essential governance instruments because fiscal accountability requires continuous monitoring evaluation and institutional discipline capable of preventing misuse of public resources and regulatory arbitrariness within decentralized administrations (El Kezazy & Hilmi, 2023). The juridical implication of these findings suggests that fiscal decentralization must be interpreted not solely through revenue distribution and expenditure authority but also through the broader legal obligation of local governments to maintain accountable regulatory environments supporting institutional trust and sustainable economic governance.

Fiscal decentralization also creates significant legal tensions concerning the balance between regional autonomy and national policy coherence because subnational governments frequently exercise financial discretion within politically fragmented administrative contexts. Hidayat Hospes and Termeer identify that democratization and decentralization in Indonesia produced uneven governance outcomes because regional administrations often lacked institutional capacity and legal harmonization mechanisms necessary for implementing accountable fiscal governance in accordance with national policy objectives (Hidayat et al., 2025). Comparative studies concerning decentralization in Nepal similarly demonstrate that local governments encounter structural limitations in delivering community services when financial authority is not supported by sufficient administrative resources and coordinated governance supervision capable of ensuring institutional effectiveness and policy consistency (Acharya & Scott, 2022). Regulatory fragmentation further intensifies accountability problems because local fiscal discretion may generate inconsistent public service quality unequal development priorities and overlapping expenditure policies across decentralized jurisdictions. The legal challenge emerging from these conditions concerns the necessity of constructing supervisory mechanisms capable of preserving regional flexibility while simultaneously ensuring that local financial governance remains aligned with constitutional welfare obligations and national administrative standards.

Comparative analysis of decentralized governance systems also reveals that corruption control remains one of the most significant determinants affecting institutional accountability and fiscal governance performance within local administrations. Transparency International data indicates that corruption vulnerabilities remain particularly pronounced in governance systems where local budget discretion operates without effective audit integration transparent procurement procedures and accessible public financial information capable of supporting societal oversight and institutional accountability (Transparency International, 2024). Zhang Tao and Su demonstrate through comparative analysis in China that legislative decentralization may produce regulatory dilution when local governments prioritize economic and political incentives over accountability obligations and environmental governance responsibilities within decentralized administrative structures (Zhang et al., 2025). Similar patterns are observable within several Southeast Asian jurisdictions where decentralized expenditure authority occasionally facilitates patronage networks and selective budget allocation practices weakening administrative integrity and public trust in regional institutions. Juridical interpretation of these findings confirms that fiscal decentralization requires robust anti corruption frameworks integrated within administrative law budget supervision and institutional transparency systems capable of constraining discretionary abuse while preserving legitimate local governmental autonomy.

The evolution of fiscal decentralization within Southeast Asian governance systems ultimately demonstrates that institutional accountability depends upon the interaction between legal regulation administrative supervision digital transparency and governance performance evaluation mechanisms operating across multilevel governmental structures. Comparative governance indicators reveal that decentralized administrations achieve stronger accountability outcomes when fiscal authority is accompanied by enforceable transparency obligations integrated oversight institutions and coherent regulatory coordination capable of reducing corruption risks and administrative fragmentation. Empirical normative analysis further indicates that fiscal decentralization cannot be evaluated solely through revenue allocation formulas or expenditure autonomy because the legitimacy of decentralized governance depends fundamentally upon whether regional financial authority contributes to accountable public administration and equitable service delivery within legally structured governance frameworks. ASEAN governance developments emphasizing administrative cooperation and regional institutional modernization also reinforce the necessity of harmonizing fiscal decentralization policies with broader accountability standards and governance quality objectives across Southeast Asian local governance systems (Association of Southeast Asian Nations, 2007 ASEAN Secretariat, 2020). The legal significance of these findings lies in the recognition that fiscal decentralization constitutes a dynamic accountability regime requiring continuous adaptation of statutory supervision institutional control and governance evaluation mechanisms in response to evolving political economic and administrative challenges within decentralized Southeast Asian states.

Digital Governance Transformation and Regulatory Fragmentation in Southeast Asian Decentralized Accountability Systems

The transformation of digital governance within Southeast Asian decentralized systems has significantly altered the structure of public accountability because governmental authority is increasingly exercised through electronic administrative platforms data integration systems and algorithmic decision making mechanisms operating across regional jurisdictions. Law Number 14 of 2008 concerning Public Information Disclosure establishes that public institutions must provide accessible information services through transparent administrative procedures capable of ensuring citizen participation and governmental accountability within evolving digital governance environments (Government of Indonesia, 2008). Law Number 25 of 2009 concerning Public Services further requires regional administrations to maintain service standards complaint mechanisms and administrative responsiveness through institutional systems that increasingly depend upon digital infrastructure and electronic governance coordination under Articles 15 and 21 of the statute (Government of Indonesia, 2009). Wadipalapa and colleagues explain that Indonesia's decentralized artificial intelligence governance policy reveals significant tensions between technological modernization and institutional coordination because local governments possess unequal administrative capacity and fragmented regulatory readiness in implementing digital governance frameworks across decentralized administrative environments (Wadipalapa et al., 2024). Comparative governance analysis indicates that digital transformation within decentralized systems strengthens administrative efficiency only when legal regulation technological infrastructure and institutional supervision evolve simultaneously within coherent accountability frameworks capable of preserving legal certainty and public oversight.

The expansion of electronic governance systems has fundamentally reshaped institutional accountability because digital administration transforms the relationship between governmental transparency administrative supervision and citizen participation within decentralized governance structures. Antoni Rahayu and Lestari demonstrate that electronic governance significantly mediates local governmental financial accountability because digital systems improve monitoring accessibility and administrative traceability within regional public institutions operating under decentralized authority structures (Antoni et al., 2026). Empirical evidence further indicates that regional administrations utilizing integrated electronic governance systems generally exhibit stronger responsiveness and reduced procedural opacity compared with jurisdictions dependent upon fragmented administrative reporting systems and manual governance mechanisms (World Bank, 2025). Parindingan Haliah and Nirwana identify that the digitalization of regional financial reporting has strengthened transparency obligations and public accessibility to governmental information although implementation disparities remain evident because technological readiness and institutional professionalism differ significantly across local governments (Parindingan et al., 2024). The juridical implication of these findings demonstrates that digital governance cannot be treated merely as an administrative modernization strategy because electronic accountability mechanisms increasingly constitute enforceable legal obligations connected to transparency rights and procedural fairness within decentralized public administration systems.

.

The emergence of digital governance has simultaneously intensified regulatory fragmentation because decentralized administrations frequently develop divergent technological standards institutional procedures and data governance regulations without integrated legal coordination mechanisms capable of preserving accountability coherence. Law Number 23 of 2014 concerning Regional Government authorizes local governments to manage administrative innovation and public service delivery according to regional needs although the absence of harmonized digital governance standards frequently generates overlapping regulatory authority and inconsistent institutional implementation among decentralized jurisdictions (Government of Indonesia, 2014). Yuwono Wiryawan and Yuzuru explain that regulatory governance quality directly affects institutional performance and investment confidence because fragmented administrative systems create uncertainty concerning licensing procedures supervisory standards and digital regulatory compliance within decentralized governance environments (Yuwono et al., 2025). Comparative governance trends across Southeast Asia reveal that decentralized digital governance often produces coordination crises when regional administrations adopt incompatible technological systems and inconsistent legal interpretations concerning data management administrative supervision and public accountability obligations. Socio legal interpretation of these developments suggests that regulatory fragmentation constitutes not merely a technical governance problem but a structural legal challenge affecting institutional legitimacy administrative predictability and citizen access to accountable public services within decentralized governance systems.

Administrative coordination crises increasingly emerge within decentralized digital governance environments because local governments exercise technological discretion under divergent institutional capacities and regulatory frameworks lacking integrated supervision mechanisms. ASEAN Community Vision 2025 emphasizes regional cooperation institutional modernization and digital connectivity as strategic governance objectives although implementation remains dependent upon national and subnational administrative harmonization mechanisms capable of supporting coordinated accountability systems across Southeast Asian jurisdictions (ASEAN Secretariat, 2020). Comparative institutional analysis demonstrates that governance fragmentation frequently weakens administrative effectiveness because decentralized digital systems create procedural inconsistency overlapping institutional authority and uneven public service accessibility among local governments operating within multilevel governance arrangements. Ortega and Acero identify that organizational culture and institutional politics significantly affect local governmental performance because administrative behavior and bureaucratic coordination frequently determine whether governance innovation strengthens accountability or instead intensifies institutional fragmentation and procedural inefficiency (Ortega & Acero, 2025). The legal significance of these findings lies in the recognition that administrative coordination constitutes an essential accountability requirement within decentralized digital governance systems because fragmented institutional authority may undermine both legal certainty and public trust in governmental administration.

The expansion of hybrid governance arrangements involving public private cooperation has transformed the institutional structure of accountability because public functions are increasingly implemented through collaborative arrangements operating beyond traditional bureaucratic frameworks. Research concerning public private partnerships in Thailand demonstrates that decentralized governance systems increasingly rely upon collaborative institutional arrangements integrating governmental authority private sector participation and regional development objectives through contractual and regulatory coordination mechanisms (Laochankham et al., 2024). These governance transformations create complex legal questions concerning responsibility allocation transparency obligations and administrative supervision because accountability mechanisms designed for hierarchical governmental structures may become inadequate within hybrid institutional environments. Sumaryana Komara and Pancasilawan explain that governance planning and policy evaluation in local asset management require integrated accountability structures capable of monitoring institutional coordination and preventing administrative fragmentation within decentralized governance systems characterized by expanding collaborative arrangements (Sumaryana et al., 2024). Comparative legal interpretation indicates that future accountability frameworks must evolve toward hybrid regulatory models capable of governing interactions among public institutions private entities and digital administrative systems within increasingly networked governance environments.

.

Table 3. Comparative Models of Digital Governance and Regulatory Fragmentation in Southeast Asian Local Governance Systems

Country	Digital Governance Policy	Local Accountability Mechanism	Coordination Model	Regulatory Risk	Legal Implication
Indonesia	Decentralized electronic governance and artificial intelligence initiatives	Regional digital reporting and public information systems	Mixed central and regional coordination	Fragmented digital standards	Requires harmonized digital administrative regulation
Thailand	Public private digital governance cooperation	Contractual and institutional oversight	Coordinated partnership governance	Accountability diffusion	Strengthening hybrid supervision mechanisms
Philippines	Localized electronic governance adaptation	Municipal administrative monitoring	Regionally varied implementation	Uneven institutional capacity	Need for standardized procedural regulation
Vietnam	Centrally integrated digital administration	Hierarchical administrative supervision	Strong central coordination	Limited regional flexibility	Administrative coherence prioritized

Source: Processed from Wadipalapa et al. 2024 Laochankham et al. 2024 World Bank 2025 ASEAN Secretariat 2020 and Transparency International 2024.

The comparative governance patterns reflected in Table 3 demonstrate that Southeast Asian digital governance systems produce divergent accountability consequences depending upon the relationship between technological integration regulatory coordination and institutional supervision mechanisms. Indonesia illustrates a decentralized digital governance model characterized by substantial regional experimentation and innovation although fragmented technological standards and uneven institutional capacity continue to create accountability inconsistencies across local administrations. Thailand presents a hybrid governance model emphasizing collaborative public private coordination mechanisms although accountability diffusion remains a significant legal concern because institutional responsibility frequently becomes dispersed across contractual and administrative arrangements (Laochankham et al., 2024). Vietnam adopts a more centralized digital governance structure prioritizing administrative coherence and hierarchical supervision although regional flexibility and localized innovation become comparatively constrained within tightly coordinated institutional systems. Comparative socio legal analysis suggests that digital governance effectiveness depends less upon technological adoption alone than upon the existence of coherent legal frameworks capable of regulating coordination accountability and institutional responsibility across decentralized governance structures.

Digital transparency mechanisms increasingly function as essential anti corruption instruments because electronic governance systems create opportunities for public oversight administrative traceability and institutional monitoring within decentralized governance environments vulnerable to discretionary abuse. Transparency International data demonstrates that corruption risks remain particularly significant within local administrations characterized by opaque digital procurement systems fragmented administrative supervision and limited public access to governmental information concerning budget implementation and institutional decision making processes (Transparency International, 2024). Comparative analysis by Zhang Tao and Su further reveals that decentralized regulatory authority may facilitate regulatory dilution when local governments prioritize political and economic incentives over accountability obligations and institutional supervision standards within technologically evolving governance systems (Zhang et al., 2025). Empirical governance evidence across Southeast Asia similarly indicates that digitalization without coherent accountability regulation may merely transfer corruption risks from conventional bureaucratic processes toward technologically mediated administrative systems lacking effective legal oversight mechanisms. Juridical interpretation of these developments confirms that digital transparency requires enforceable legal standards governing data disclosure algorithmic accountability electronic procurement and public access rights capable of ensuring substantive accountability within decentralized digital governance environments.

The adaptation of Southeast Asian governance systems toward digital accountability models also reveals significant disparities in institutional capacity administrative professionalism and regulatory harmonization affecting the implementation of accountable governance frameworks. World Bank governance indicators demonstrate that regional administrations possessing integrated digital governance systems and coordinated regulatory supervision generally achieve stronger institutional performance and public administration effectiveness compared with jurisdictions characterized by fragmented technological implementation and inconsistent administrative procedures (World Bank, 2025). Comparative findings from the Philippines and Nepal indicate that decentralized governance reforms frequently encounter implementation limitations because local governments possess uneven administrative capacity and insufficient technological resources necessary for maintaining accountable electronic governance systems within complex multilevel institutional structures (Cruz, 2024 Acharya & Scott, 2022). Hidayat Hospes and Termeer similarly identify that decentralization reforms in Indonesia generated mixed governance outcomes because democratic institutional expansion was not consistently accompanied by sufficient administrative coordination and technological integration capable of supporting effective accountability enforcement (Hidayat et al., 2025). These findings demonstrate that future governance reform cannot rely exclusively upon technological modernization because digital accountability requires simultaneous institutional strengthening legal harmonization and coordinated administrative adaptation within decentralized governance systems.

The future development of decentralized accountability systems in Southeast Asia increasingly depends upon the capacity of legal institutions to integrate digital governance regulatory harmonization and institutional coordination within adaptive governance frameworks responsive to technological and administrative transformation. ASEAN institutional developments emphasize the importance of regional cooperation administrative modernization and governance connectivity although effective implementation requires domestic legal systems capable of translating regional governance principles into enforceable accountability structures operating across local governmental institutions (Association of Southeast Asian Nations, 2007 ASEAN Secretariat, 2020). Comparative legal analysis demonstrates that future accountability models must integrate administrative law principles digital governance regulation institutional supervision and public participation mechanisms within coherent frameworks capable of governing technologically mediated public administration systems. Empirical evidence further indicates that decentralized governance systems achieve stronger institutional legitimacy when technological innovation is accompanied by transparent procedural safeguards integrated regulatory standards and enforceable public oversight mechanisms capable of limiting discretionary administrative conduct. The juridical challenge facing Southeast Asian governance systems concerns the construction of adaptive legal regimes capable of preserving accountability coherence and democratic legitimacy within increasingly digitalized decentralized administrative environments characterized by rapid technological transformation and expanding institutional complexity.

CONCLUSION

The legal evolution of decentralization in Southeast Asia demonstrates that public accountability within local governance systems cannot be understood solely through constitutional delegation of authority because accountability effectiveness ultimately depends upon the coherence between decentralization norms fiscal governance structures and adaptive regulatory capacity within rapidly transforming administrative environments. Constitutional and statutory frameworks in Indonesia and other Southeast Asian jurisdictions formally recognize regional autonomy as an instrument for democratic participation administrative responsiveness and public service improvement although empirical governance evidence reveals persistent disparities in institutional performance regulatory consistency and accountability enforcement across decentralized governmental structures. Fiscal decentralization has strengthened local administrative authority and regional economic flexibility while simultaneously generating legal vulnerabilities associated with budgetary opacity corruption risks supervisory fragmentation and uneven governmental capacity in managing public finance accountability. The expansion of digital governance and hybrid administrative coordination has further transformed the architecture of public accountability because electronic governance systems algorithmic administration and collaborative public private arrangements increasingly challenge conventional models of administrative supervision and legal responsibility. Comparative juridical analysis confirms that decentralized governance systems achieve stronger accountability outcomes when constitutional principles statutory regulation institutional supervision fiscal transparency and digital governance mechanisms operate within integrated legal frameworks capable of preserving regulatory coherence administrative efficiency and democratic legitimacy across multilevel governance systems in Southeast Asia.

REFERENCES

Acharya, K. K., & Scott, J. (2022). A study of the capabilities and limitations of local governments in providing community services in Nepal. *Public Administration and Policy*, *25*(1), 64-77. https://doi.org/10.1108/PAP-01-2022-0006

Antoni, S., Rahayu, S., & Lestari, W. (2026). Determinants of Local Government Financial Accountability in Indonesia: The Mediating Role of E-Government. *KASTA: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Agama, Budaya dan Terapan*, *6*(1), 512-530. https://doi.org/10.58218/kasta.v6i1.2672

ASEAN Secretariat. (2020). *ASEAN Community Vision 2025*.

Association of Southeast Asian Nations. (2007). *ASEAN Charter*.

Constitutional Court of the Republic of Indonesia. (2016). *Decision Number 56/PUU-XIV/2016*.

Cruz, J. D. (2024). Assessing the Effectiveness of Local Government Decentralization in Enhancing Public Service Delivery in the Philippines. *Mahogany Journal De Social*, *1*(4), 214-223. https://doi.org/10.37899/mjds.v1i4.165

Dinh Thanh, S., Nguyen, C. P., Duy-Tung, B., Binh, N. Q., & Van, D. T. B. (2023). Spatial spillover effects of fiscal decentralization on governance and public administration quality. *Regional Studies*, *57*(3), 478-496. https://doi.org/10.1080/00343404.2022.2078801

El Kezazy, H., & Hilmi, Y. (2023). Improving good governance through management control in local authorities. *International Review of Management And Computer*, *7*(3). https://dx.doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10577979

Faguet, J.-P. (2012). *Making decentralization work: Democracy, development, and security*.

Fauji, Z., & Syafitri, W. (2024). The impact of local governance and regional own-source revenue on economic growth at the district level in Indonesia. *Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, *27*(2), 153-174. https://doi.org/10.24914/jeb.v27i2.11606

Fitria, F., Nuriyatman, E., Amir, L., & Saraya, S. (2025). Administrative law and the efficiency of local government budgeting. *As-Siyasi: Journal of Constitutional Law*, *5*(1), 147-161. https://doi.org/10.24042/as-siyasi.v51.27598

Gilley, B., & Laochankham, S. (2024). Can fiscal recentralization strengthen local government? The case of Thailand. *International Journal of Public Administration*, *47*(4), 257-268.https://doi.org/10.1080/01900692.2022.2111580

Government of Indonesia. (1945). *The 1945 Constitution of the Republic of Indonesia*.

Government of Indonesia. (2008). *Law Number 14 of 2008 on Public Information Disclosure*.

Government of Indonesia. (2009). *Law Number 25 of 2009 on Public Services*.

Government of Indonesia. (2014). *Law Number 23 of 2014 on Regional Government*.

Government of Indonesia. (2022). *Law Number 1 of 2022 on Fiscal Relations between the Central Government and Regional Governments*.

Hadjon, P. M. (2011). *Pengantar hukum administrasi Indonesia*.

Hidayat, A. R., Hospes, O., & Termeer, C. J. A. M. (2025). Why democratization and decentralization in indonesia have mixed results on the ground: A systematic literature review. *Public Administration and Development*, *45*(2), 159-172. https://doi.org/10.1002/pad.2095

Huda, N. (2019). *Hukum pemerintahan daerah*. Rajawali Pers.

Hummel, D., & Kusumasari, B. (2025). Local Government Financial Performance and Decentralization in Indonesia. *State and Local Government Review*, 0160323X251364379. https://doi.org/10.1177/0160323X251364379

Islam, S. (2025). A systematic review of public budgeting strategies in developing economies: Tools for transparent fiscal governance. *American Journal of Advanced Technology and Engineering Solutions*, *1*(01), 602-635. https://doi.org/10.63125/wm547117

Laochankham, S., Kamnuansilpa, P., & Hicken, A. (2024). The Evolution and Institutionalisation of Business–Government Relations: Public–Private Partnerships in Khon Kaen, Thailand. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, *43*(2), 308-330. https://doi.org/10.1177/18681034241261405

Lewis, B. D. (2023). Indonesia's new fiscal decentralisation law: A critical assessment. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, *59*(1), 1-28. https://doi.org/10.1080/00074918.2023.2180838

Mohammed, A. S., Tuokuu, F. X., & Bokuma, A. (2025). Decentralization and local government performance: empirical evidence from Ghana. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, *60*(5), 3219-3239. https://doi.org/10.1177/00219096241228777

Ortega, L., & Acero, J. P. (2025). The nexus of organizational culture and work performance: The mediating role of organizational politics in local government setting. *Global Review of Tourism and Social Sciences*, *1*(2), 129-144.https://doi.org/10.53893/grtss.v1i2.362

Parindingan, F. Y., Haliah, H., & Nirwana, N. (2024). Evaluation of transparency and accountability of regional government financial reports in the digitalization era. *Journal of Accounting and Finance Management*, *5*(5), 1051-1058. https://doi.org/10.38035/jafm.v5i5.1066

Sumaryana, A., Komara, S. R., & Pancasilawan, R. (2024). Rethinking local government asset management in Indonesia: Governance, planning, and policy evaluation. *Journal of Contemporary Governance and Public Policy*, *5*(2), 217-232. https://doi.org/10.46507/jcgpp.v5i2.643

Transparency International. (2024). *Corruption perceptions index 2024*.

Wadipalapa, R. P., Katharina, R., Nainggolan, P. P., Aminah, S., Apriani, T., Ma'rifah, D., & Anisah, A. L. (2024). An ambitious artificial intelligence policy in a decentralised governance system: evidence from Indonesia. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, *43*(1), 65-93. https://doi.org/10.1177/18681034231226393

World Bank. (2025). *Worldwide Governance Indicators*. World Bank Group.

Yuwono, T., Wiryawan, B. A., & Yuzuru, S. (2025). The effect of regulatory governance system on investment growth in decentralized Indonesia. *Frontiers in Political Science*, *7*, 1630368. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2025.1630368

Zhang, C., Tao, R., & Su, F. (2025). Legislative decentralization and regulatory dilution: Evidence from air pollution control in China. *World Development*, *191*, 107002. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2025.107002