
Asymmetric Decentralization and Policy Misalignment in Jakarta: A Systematic Review of Governance, Coordination, and Conflict Management

Muhamad Sirod¹, Anang Puji Utama², Panji Suwarno³, Arifuddin Uksan⁴, Rachmat
Setiawibawa⁵

Universitas Pertahanan Republik Indonesia
E-mail: muhammad.sirod@kn.idu.ac.id

Article History:

Received: 01 Maret 2026

Revised: 26 Maret 2026

Accepted: 02 April 2026

Keywords:

Conflict
Management, Coordination,
Decentralization, Governance
Efficiency, Public
Administration.

Abstract: *This study systematically examines how asymmetric decentralization influences governance efficiency, intergovernmental coordination, and conflict management in Jakarta's provincial administration. The research employs a Systematic Literature Review (SLR) method by analyzing 50 empirical studies selected through structured database searches, citation chaining, and relevance screening. The review focuses on key themes including administrative efficiency, policy-making dynamics, and mechanisms of conflict resolution within Jakarta's unique decentralized governance structure. The findings indicate that decentralization enhances local government responsiveness and encourages policy innovation, allowing provincial authorities to address complex urban challenges more effectively. However, the implementation of asymmetric decentralization remains constrained by several structural issues, including institutional fragmentation, overlapping authority among governmental agencies, and inconsistent coordination across administrative levels. These challenges often reduce policy effectiveness and complicate governance processes. The study also highlights the growing potential of digital governance and participatory governance mechanisms to strengthen transparency, accountability, and policy coordination in metropolitan governance. Nevertheless, their implementation still faces limitations related to regulatory readiness, institutional capacity, and administrative integration. Overall, this study provides an integrated synthesis of Jakarta's experience with asymmetric decentralization and offers context-sensitive policy insights for improving governance effectiveness in complex metropolitan regions while contributing to the broader theoretical discussion on asymmetric governance models.*

INTRODUCTION

Decentralization and policy-making in the Jakarta Provincial Government represent a critical field of inquiry due to their implications for administrative efficiency, public service

obligations, and social conflict management in Indonesia's most complex metropolitan area. Indonesia's decentralization system was formally institutionalized through Law No. 22/1999, later revised by Law No. 32/2004 and consolidated through Law No. 23/2014 on Regional Government, which redistributed authority from the central to regional governments to promote service quality, policy responsiveness, and equitable development. Complementing this framework, fiscal transfers and regional budget management are regulated under Law No. 33/2004 on Fiscal Balance, requiring local governments to ensure budget efficiency to avoid deficits, reduce waste, and optimize public service delivery. These regulations underscore the principle of public service obligation (PSO), in which provincial governments must allocate resources responsibly to maintain essential services such as transportation, public infrastructure, social assistance, and conflict mitigation mechanisms. Failure to implement budget efficiency measures may trigger service disruptions, administrative delays, and heightened social tensions, particularly in urban regions like Jakarta where service demands are high and political dynamics are complex.

Historically, decentralization in Indonesia emerged after Reformasi as a response to the excessive centralization of the New Order era, which had produced bureaucratic rigidity and limited local autonomy. Decentralization is theoretically rooted in governance and public administration literature, emphasizing principles of subsidiarity, multilevel governance, and collaborative governance, which posit that local governments are better positioned to identify community needs, manage resources, and mitigate local conflicts (Nugroho & Sujarwoto, 2022). Comparative evidence shows that decentralization has been effective in several countries, such as Switzerland, where strong cantonal autonomy, clear authority division, and well-institutionalized coordination mechanisms support efficient public service delivery and conflict resolution across regions (Kübler & Rochat, 2016). These examples demonstrate the potential advantages of decentralization enhanced responsiveness, innovation, and participatory governance when supported by coherent institutional arrangements.

However, Jakarta's decentralized governance operates under asymmetric arrangements due to its dual role as capital region and autonomous province, creating unique administrative complexities (Rahmatunnisa et al., 2018). Studies identify recurring problems including policy misalignment between central and provincial authorities, overlapping institutional mandates, sectoral ego, inconsistent budget allocation, and fragmented coordination across agencies (Aulia & Tambun, 2025). Such fragmentation undermines budget efficiency, reduces public service performance, and weakens mechanisms for managing social conflict, an urgent concern given Jakarta's demographic diversity and frequent socio-political tensions (Anadirga et al., 2024).

The academic debate on decentralization in Indonesia reflects both supportive and critical perspectives. Pro-decentralization findings emphasize improved local participation, better alignment with community needs, and administrative innovation in regions with strong institutional capacity (Mulanda et al., 2024). Conversely, critical perspectives highlight risks such as corruption, inconsistent service delivery, weak coordination, and political competition between local and central actors, which often impede policy effectiveness (Guridno, 2024). Jakarta's case illustrates these tensions: while decentralization provides autonomy, it simultaneously generates governance vulnerabilities due to ambiguous authority distribution and bureaucratic overlap (Judijanto & Datumula, 2024).

Despite a growing body of research, there remains a significant knowledge gap in understanding how decentralization, coordination mechanisms, policy misalignment, and conflict governance interact specifically within Jakarta's institutional context. Existing studies

often examine these elements separately, resulting in fragmented insights that fail to capture their interdependence. This study addresses that gap by offering a comprehensive systematic review that synthesizes theoretical frameworks, empirical findings, and institutional challenges across these dimensions. The novelty of this research lies in its integrated analysis that connects decentralization outcomes with administrative efficiency, budget governance, and conflict management within Jakarta's asymmetric and highly politicized governance structure, an intersection rarely explored holistically in prior literature.

Accordingly, this study aims to evaluate how decentralization shapes administrative efficiency and the fulfillment of public service obligations (PSO) in Jakarta, while also examining the effectiveness of policy-making processes and coordination mechanisms in addressing social conflict. In addition, the study seeks to synthesize both theoretical and empirical perspectives on decentralization and governance in order to provide a comprehensive understanding of how decentralized systems operate within complex metropolitan settings. The research further analyzes the institutional arrangements between central and provincial authorities, particularly in terms of authority distribution, policy coordination, and administrative responsibilities. Through this analysis, the study also aims to identify key structural challenges as well as potential opportunities for improving governance coherence, enhancing budget efficiency, and strengthening mechanisms for conflict management within Jakarta's asymmetric decentralization framework.

By integrating these strands of analysis, the study advances a more nuanced understanding of Jakarta's decentralization dynamics and provides evidence-based recommendations to enhance governance performance in Indonesia.

RESEARCH METHODS

This study employed a systematic literature review (SLR) approach to examine decentralization, governance efficiency, and social conflict management in Jakarta. The review followed four integrated stages designed to ensure comprehensiveness and methodological rigor. The process began with query transformation, in which the central research question was expanded into several focused search strings to capture diverse dimensions of decentralization, policy coordination, and conflict governance. These search strings were used across major academic databases.

Following the search expansion, a screening stage was conducted to filter the initial 420 retrieved papers using predetermined inclusion and exclusion criteria related to relevance, publication quality, geographical focus, and methodological clarity. To strengthen the coverage of the review, the study then applied citation chaining, both backward and forward, which provided an additional 81 relevant studies that had not appeared in the initial database search. This step ensured that influential and foundational works were included.

The final stage involved relevance scoring, where all 501 papers identified through screening and citation chaining were assessed using a structured relevance rubric. Through this scoring process, 50 highly relevant studies were selected for the final synthesis. These studies were subsequently analyzed thematically to extract theoretical insights, identify recurring governance challenges, and map policy implications associated with Jakarta's decentralization and conflict management dynamics.

Thematic Review of Literature

Decentralization within the Jakarta Provincial Government is a multifaceted subject encompassing administrative efficiency, policy-making processes, intergovernmental

coordination, and social conflict management. The literature reveals a complex interplay between theoretical frameworks and practical governance challenges, particularly highlighting issues of institutional capacity, political dynamics, and the synchronization of policies across governmental levels. Social conflict management emerges as a critical concern given Jakarta's diverse and rapidly urbanizing context, necessitating innovative and participatory governance approaches. Additionally, empirical studies underscore the ongoing need for enhanced public service delivery, technological adaptation, and inclusive community engagement to improve policy outcomes in Jakarta's decentralized governance system.

Chronological Review of Literature

Literature on the Jakarta Provincial Government and decentralization displays a progression from foundational governance challenges and administrative structuring to nuanced analyses of policy implementation, social conflict management, and intergovernmental coordination. Earlier works focus on the establishment of institutional frameworks and the effects of decentralization on governance efficiency, while later studies increasingly tackle practical solutions, including public participation, policy synchronization, and digital transformation. Recent research emphasizes adaptive governance models, multi-stakeholder collaboration, and the complexities posed by political dynamics and urban challenges in Jakarta. This evolution reflects a deepening understanding of decentralization's multifaceted impact on policy-making and social stability within Jakarta's unique administrative context.

Agreement and Divergence Across Studies

The reviewed studies collectively recognize the complex influence of decentralization on Jakarta's governance, highlighting improvements in administrative efficiency and opportunities for localized policy innovation. Most authors agree on challenges related to institutional coordination and overlapping jurisdiction, which often hinder policy effectiveness and social conflict management. Divergences arise in perceptions of decentralization's overall impact, with some emphasizing positive developments in capacity and service delivery, while others underline persistent structural and political obstacles. These variations are frequently attributed to different methodological approaches, scopes of analysis, and the evolving political-administrative context of Jakarta.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

This section maps the research landscape of the literature on Jakarta Provincial Government, decentralization, policy-making, administrative efficiency, theoretical knowledge, practical solutions, policy recommendations, social conflict management, revealing a diverse array of studies that address governance challenges in Jakarta's unique administrative context. The reviewed works employ qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods, with a strong emphasis on policy analysis, institutional coordination, and conflict management within decentralized frameworks. The geographic focus is predominantly Jakarta, with some comparative insights from other Indonesian regions, providing a comprehensive understanding relevant to the research questions on decentralization's impact on governance efficiency and social stability. This comparative synthesis highlights patterns, gaps, and practical implications that inform policy recommendations and theoretical-practical integration in Jakarta's governance.

Table 1. Summary of Literature Review on Decentralization and Governance Effectiveness in Jakarta Provincial Government

Study	Administrative Efficiency	Policy-Making Effectiveness	Institutional Coordination	Conflict Management Strategies	Theoretical-Practical Integration
(Akbar & Ahmad, 2023)	Effective resource use via community forums and government support	Policy implementation supported by local participation	Strong local government and community collaboration	Early warning forums reduce social conflict effectively	Combines legal frameworks with community practice
(Apriansyah et al., 2024)	Moderate efficiency hindered by communication gaps and bureaucratic challenges	Policy directives partially effective; need better communication	Coordination issues among agencies affect policy enforcement	Groundwater conservation policies show mixed success	Applies policy implementation theory to practical water management
(Oktavia et al., 2025)	Decentralization improves autonomy but uneven bureaucratic capacity limits efficiency	Policy reforms face challenges from fiscal inequality and corruption	Weak central-local coordination causes policy overlap	Conflict potential due to political dynamics noted	Integrates literature review with governance reform analysis
(Samsidar, 2025)	Institutional capacity and leadership critical for effective administration	Mixed policy outcomes influenced by community participation	Coordination weaknesses hamper policy effectiveness	Structural and cultural obstacles affect conflict resolution	Literature-based synthesis linking theory and practice
(Scorpio & Nursadi, 2025)	Synchronization council aligns regional policies without reducing autonomy	Policy coordination improves spatial and development planning	Agglomeration council enhances intergovernmental synchronization	Conflict minimized through policy alignment mechanisms	Normative juridical approach linking law and governance

(Aulia & Tambun, 2025)	Public service efficiency limited by policy misalignment	Policy misalignment reduces effectiveness in social conflict management	Weak vertical and horizontal coordination identified	Policy misalignment indirectly exacerbates social tensions	Literature review proposing governance reforms
(Judijanto & Datumula, 2024)	Institutional capacity strongly influences public service effectiveness	Regulatory quality and coordination improve policy outcomes	Interagency collaboration positively affects service delivery	Effective coordination reduces conflict potential	Quantitative analysis linking governance factors to outcomes
(Agung, 2025)	Bureaucratic inefficiency limits administrative efficiency	Digital disruption challenges policy-making effectiveness	Pentahelix collaboration enhances institutional coordination	Multi-sector collaboration aids conflict mitigation	Qualitative study bridging theory and digital governance practice
(Windiatmoko et al., 2024)	Licensing system efficiency hampered by overlapping jurisdictions	Policy implementation challenged by legal uncertainties	Coordination between central and local licensing agencies weak	Licensing conflicts addressed through socialization and innovation	Case study linking policy theory with licensing practice
(Sialen, 2024)	Capacity building needed for efficient e-government implementation	Policy effectiveness depends on bureaucratic readiness	Coordination essential for e-government success	No direct conflict management focus	Theoretical framework applied to practical capacity development
(Mulanda et al., 2024)	Decentralization fosters community engagement improving efficiency	Participation enhances policy-making but barriers remain	Coordination between government and community varies	Participation reduces social conflict risks	Literature review linking decentralization and participation
(Reba, 2024)	Capacity gaps and coordination problems reduce administrative efficiency	Policy opportunities exist but challenges persist	Central-local coordination critical for policy success	Conflict potential linked to coordination failures	Normative legal analysis with practical governance insights

Administrative Efficiency:

The findings indicate that administrative efficiency in Jakarta has been shaped not only by institutional capacity and coordination but also by a series of formal regulatory instruments enacted to enforce fiscal discipline, streamline organizational structures, and rationalize public expenditures. Several key regulations demonstrate Jakarta's concrete policy actions in improving administrative efficiency.

A central measure is the implementation of mandatory budget rationalization under Governor Regulation No. 65/2020 on Budget Refocusing and Reallocation, issued in response to fiscal constraints and later institutionalized as a recurrent efficiency mandate. This regulation required each Regional Government Agencies (OPD) to reduce non-priority spending particularly travel, meetings, and procurement of goods and services and redirect funds toward essential public services and contingency reserves. The same spirit of expenditure control is reinforced in Governor Regulation No. 90/2018 on Standard Expenditure Analysis (ASB) and Governor Regulation No. 82/2022 on Budget Management, which regulate efficiency thresholds and limit inflated spending in operational units. These regulations form the legal basis for Jakarta's recurring efficiency cuts found across multiple studies that document reductions in non-essential functions and tighter spending controls in OPDs (Yustianto et al., 2025).

In addition to budget cuts, Jakarta has undertaken structural reforms designed to streamline administration. Regional Regulation No. 2/2016 on the Formation and Organizational Structure of Regional Government Agencies provides the framework for reorganizing OPDs to reduce functional overlap and enhance coordination. Subsequent adjustments through No. 132/2019 strengthened organizational consolidation by merging units with redundant mandates. Literature shows that this reorganization improved managerial clarity but also revealed discrepancies in institutional capacity that continue to influence efficiency outcomes (Sialen, 2024).

Jakarta has also pursued administrative digitalization as a core efficiency mechanism. Ingub No. 23/2022 on Digital Transformation Acceleration mandates the adoption of integrated e-government systems, including online licensing through the OSS-RBA (Online Single Submission Risk Based Approach) and digitized internal workflows. Empirical studies record measurable efficiency gains from this integration such as reduced licensing delays and lower administrative burden although uneven bureaucratic readiness still constrains full implementation (Windiatmoko et al., 2024).

Further evidence of expenditure restraint appears in Jakarta's efforts to control personnel and operational costs. The use of Performance-Based Budgeting (PBB) protocols, supported by No. 92/2021 on Performance Evaluation, has enabled OPDs to tie budget allocations to measurable outputs. This has contributed to a reduction in non-performing programs and enhanced accountability in social assistance, transportation, and urban infrastructure spending (Akbar & Ahmad, 2023).

Overall, the results indicate that Jakarta's administrative efficiency reforms are not merely theoretical but are supported by a coherent regulatory framework aimed at strengthening governance and improving public sector performance. These reforms include budget rationalization and refocusing implemented through Governor Regulation (Pergub) No. 65/2020 and the Standard Expenditure Analysis (ASB) regulations, which aim to enhance fiscal discipline and ensure more efficient allocation of public funds. In addition, organizational restructuring has been pursued under Regional Regulation (Perda) No. 2/2016 along with subsequent institutional

adjustments to streamline bureaucratic structures, reduce functional overlap, and improve coordination among regional government agencies. The reform agenda is further reinforced by the integration of digital bureaucracy, particularly through the implementation of the Online Single Submission – Risk Based Approach (OSS-RBA) system and Governor Instruction (Ingub) No. 23/2022, which promote more efficient, transparent, and technology-driven administrative processes. Moreover, the adoption of Governor Regulation (Pergub) No. 92/2021 introduces performance-based expenditure control mechanisms that link budgeting with measurable outcomes and accountability standards. Together, these regulatory instruments demonstrate that Jakarta's administrative reform efforts are institutionally grounded and strategically designed to improve governance coherence, fiscal efficiency, and bureaucratic effectiveness.

Despite these measures, challenges remain in bureaucratic coordination, uneven institutional capacity, and persistent policy overlap between central and provincial authorities, factors widely noted in empirical studies to undermine Jakarta's full efficiency potential (Kusuma et al., 2023).

Policy-Making Effectiveness:

- Approximately 25 studies report that policy-making effectiveness is often constrained by weak communication, political dynamics, and coordination failures, impacting social conflict management and service delivery (Guridno, 2024).
- Some research emphasizes the positive role of community engagement and collaborative governance in enhancing policy outcomes (Surya, 2024)
- Legal and institutional reforms are suggested to address policy fragmentation and improve decision-making quality (Febriandiela et al., 2024).

Institutional Coordination:

- Around 30 studies underscore that effective coordination between central and local government agencies is essential but frequently inadequate, leading to policy overlaps and inefficiencies (Lutfi & Hariyati, 2020).
- Multi-sector collaboration models, such as Pentahelix and agglomeration councils, show promise in improving coordination (Agung, 2025).
- Coordination challenges are exacerbated by political conflicts and unclear authority delineations (Kusuma et al., 2023).

Conflict Management Strategies:

- Nearly 20 studies analyze conflict management approaches, noting that integrated teams and early warning forums contribute to mitigating social conflicts but face bureaucratic and coordination challenges.
- Political conflicts and policy misalignments often exacerbate social tensions, requiring inclusive and transparent governance mechanisms.
- Community participation and accountability mechanisms are effective in reducing conflict potential.

Theoretical-Practical Integration:

More than 25 studies successfully bridge theoretical frameworks with practical governance experiences, applying policy implementation theories and collaborative governance models to Jakarta's context. Some research identifies gaps between normative ideals and real-world practices, calling for adaptive and context-specific approaches (Widhiantari, 2025). The integration of digital governance and participatory mechanisms is highlighted as a pathway to enhance practical policy outcomes. The literature on decentralization and governance in Jakarta reveals a complex interplay between theoretical frameworks and practical governance challenges.

While many studies highlight the potential of decentralization to enhance administrative efficiency, local autonomy, and social conflict management, there is a recurrent theme of institutional and coordination weaknesses that undermine these benefits. The research collectively underscores the importance of intergovernmental synchronization, capacity building, and inclusive policy-making, yet often points to persistent gaps in implementation, political dynamics, and bureaucratic inefficiencies. This synthesis critically evaluates these dimensions, emphasizing the strengths and limitations of the current body of knowledge in addressing Jakarta’s unique governance context.

Table 2. Summary of Thematic Findings on Decentralization and Governance Performance in Jakarta

Aspect	Strengths	Weaknesses
Impact of Decentralization on Administrative Efficiency	Several studies demonstrate that decentralization has enabled greater local autonomy and innovation in public service delivery, particularly in high-capacity regions like Jakarta, contributing to improved administrative performance and responsiveness to local needs. Empirical findings also highlight the positive role of fiscal decentralization in enhancing budget accountability and institutional readiness (Yustianto et al., 2025).	Despite these gains, the literature consistently identifies significant disparities in bureaucratic capacity, fiscal dependence on the central government, and uneven institutional readiness, which limit the overall effectiveness of decentralization in Jakarta. The persistence of overlapping authorities and fragmented policy implementation further hampers administrative efficiency.

Policy-Making Frameworks and Social Conflict Management	Research on social conflict prevention mechanisms, such as the Community Early Warning Forum (FKDM), illustrates effective community participation supported by local government resources, fostering safer and more harmonious environments. Integrated conflict management teams, although conceptually promising, face challenges in coordination and operational effectiveness.	The literature reveals that bureaucratic partiality, weak synergy among agencies, and insufficient root-cause analysis undermine conflict management efforts. Political conflicts between local government actors also exacerbate social tensions and disrupt policy processes. Moreover, the top-down nature of many policies limits inclusive stakeholder engagement.
Institutional Arrangements and Intergovernmental Coordination	Studies emphasize the critical need for synchronization between central and local governments to avoid policy overlaps and inefficiencies, advocating for stronger coordination mechanisms and institutional reforms. The introduction of agglomeration councils and collaborative governance models shows potential for aligning regional development efforts.	However, weak vertical and horizontal coordination, sectoral egoism, and lack of institutionalized consultative platforms remain pervasive obstacles. The asymmetric decentralization model in Jakarta presents unique institutional complexities that require political will and regulatory adjustments, which are often lacking.
Capacity Building and Technological Integration	The literature identifies capacity building through training, community participation, and e-government initiatives as vital strategies to enhance governance quality and administrative efficiency. (Windiatmoko et al., 2024).	Nonetheless, implementation challenges such as limited socialization, legal uncertainties, bureaucratic resistance, and incomplete digital integration hinder the full realization of these technological solutions. Institutional readiness for digital transformation remains uneven, affecting service quality and citizen trust.

Political Dynamics and Governance Challenges	The research provides nuanced insights into how political conflicts, elite interests, and local power struggles influence governance outcomes in Jakarta, often complicating decentralization efforts. These dynamics affect policy legitimacy, administrative continuity, and democratic quality.	Political fragmentation and conflicts between the governor and legislative bodies disrupt budget processes and policy implementation, leading to delays and inefficiencies. The influence of national political conflicts on local governance further complicates decision-making and social cohesion. These issues are insufficiently addressed in many decentralization frameworks.
Public Service Effectiveness and Accountability	Quantitative and qualitative studies affirm that regulatory quality, interagency coordination, and institutional capacity significantly enhance public service effectiveness in Jakarta. Accountability mechanisms in social assistance and local government administration have been implemented with some success, contributing to improved transparency(.	Despite these improvements, accountability is often undermined by infrastructural deficits, limited competencies, and coordination gaps among implementers. The complexity of overlapping jurisdictions and fragmented policy environments challenges consistent service delivery and monitoring.
Integration of Theoretical and Practical Approaches	Several reviews provide comprehensive theoretical frameworks linking decentralization to governance outcomes, emphasizing the need for context-specific adaptations and vigilant supervision to ensure accountability and effectiveness. The literature also bridges theory with practical governance experiences, offering policy recommendations for Jakarta's unique administrative structure.	However, many studies rely heavily on qualitative or literature review methodologies, which may limit empirical generalizability and the robustness of conclusions. There is a notable gap in longitudinal and quantitative analyses that could better capture the dynamic impacts of decentralization reforms over time. Additionally, the translation of theoretical insights into actionable policy remains uneven.

Table 3. Comparative Analysis of Decentralization and Governance Studies in Jakarta

Comparison Criterion	Studies in Agreement	Studies in Divergence	Potential Explanations
Administrative Efficiency	Several studies concur that decentralization has led to improved administrative efficiency in Jakarta by enabling more responsive public service delivery and localized innovation, as evidenced by improved public services and increased use of e-Government and digital platforms. Enhanced institutional capacity and targeted resource allocation are seen as key contributors.	Some research highlights ongoing inefficiencies linked to bureaucratic complexity, hierarchical rigidity, and limited capacity at lower administrative levels. Additionally, uneven fiscal capacity and infrastructure disparities challenge sustained efficiency gains.	Agreement stems from observed improvements in technology adoption and local responsiveness, while divergence arises due to differing assessments of bureaucratic obstacles and uneven resource availability. Variations in study methods (qualitative vs quantitative) and focus on different administrative units (e.g., Urban Village vs provincial government) explain differing conclusions.
Policy-Making Effectiveness	There is consensus that decentralization has improved policy-making by incorporating local needs and fostering innovation, notably in water management and social assistance programs. The role of collaborative governance and stakeholder engagement is emphasized as critical for effective policy outcomes.	Contrarily, some studies reveal fragmented policy-making with overlapping authorities causing delays and inefficiencies. Political conflicts between the Governor and Regional People's Representative Council (DPRD) are noted to disrupt budget approval and policy implementation. Further, some argue that decentralization without institutional readiness leads to policy fragmentation.	Divergence arises mainly from differing analytical lenses and timeframes. Studies focusing on specific programs or collaborative approaches highlight effectiveness, while those emphasizing political dynamics and institutional coordination expose challenges. Contextual factors like political conflict and administrative fragmentation contribute to inconsistent policy outcomes.

Institutional Coordination	A majority agree that intergovernmental coordination is crucial yet often lacking, with weak vertical and horizontal coordination leading to policy misalignment. The need for strengthening institutional mechanisms and enhancing central-local collaboration is a recurrent theme.	Some studies suggest that existing institutional frameworks, such as the Agglomeration Area Council, help synchronize policies without undermining regional autonomy(Scorpio & Nursadi, 2025), showing partial success in coordination. Meanwhile, other research points to persistent conflicts and overlapping jurisdiction between central and local agencies, indicating ongoing coordination failures.	Agreements are based on empirical findings demonstrating coordination as a key bottleneck, while divergences reflect differences in focus—some emphasize new institutional innovations that partially mitigate conflicts, whereas others highlight unresolved jurisdictional overlaps. Differences in study periods and governance reforms also influence findings.
Conflict Management Strategies	The importance of community involvement and integrated conflict management teams is widely acknowledged. Preventative forums like Community Early Warning Forum (FKDM) and integrated teams have positively contributed to social stability in Jakarta. The role of policy synchronization and legal frameworks in mitigating social conflicts is also emphasized.	Divergence appears in the assessment of effectiveness; some studies report limited success due to bureaucratic inertia and partial coordination, while others highlight the exacerbation of conflicts linked to political tensions and national-local dynamics. Additionally, relocation policies for vulnerable groups provoke social tensions despite intentions to improve welfare.	Divergence stems from different focus areas; some research evaluates local conflict mitigation mechanisms, while others analyze broader political conflicts influencing social stability. Methodological differences (qualitative case studies vs policy reviews) and timing (pre/post recent reforms) also contribute to varied conclusions about effectiveness.

Theoretical and Practical Implications
Overview of Main Findings

This study reveals that decentralization in Jakarta produces a complex governance landscape characterized by expanded local autonomy, yet constrained by bureaucratic disparities, coordination failures, and policy misalignment between central and provincial authorities. The systematic review demonstrates that administrative efficiency is strongly influenced by institutional capacity, fiscal discipline, and regulatory coherence, while the effectiveness of policy-making is shaped by communication quality, political dynamics, and intergovernmental relations. Additionally, the findings underscore that conflict management outcomes depend heavily on participatory mechanisms, early-warning systems, and integrated institutional responses. Taken together, these results indicate that Jakarta’s decentralization outcomes reflect both the advantages promised by autonomy and the persistent risks arising from institutional

fragmentation.

Comparison with Existing Literature

The findings align with several strands of existing research. Studies by Mulanda et al. (2024) and Surya (2024) affirm that decentralization enhances local responsiveness and encourages participatory governance, consistent with this review's conclusion that community involvement contributes to improved administrative outcomes. Similarly, Judijanto & Datumula (2024) provide empirical support for the notion that coordination quality significantly affects service delivery, a theme echoed strongly in the present study.

However, the findings also reflect tensions highlighted in more critical analyses. Guridno (2024); Kusuma, et. al., (2023) report that political competition and sectoral ego frequently hinder policy implementation, consistent with this study's identification of political dynamics as a major barrier to effective decentralization in Jakarta. Divergence also appears in the literature on conflict management: while Akbar & Ahmad (2023) highlight the positive role of local early-warning forums, other studies point to uneven bureaucratic support and limited operational integration that reduce their long-term effectiveness. Such variations indicate that the benefits of decentralization are not uniform across sectors or administrative units.

The contrast between pro-decentralization and critical perspectives is particularly evident in the literature on administrative efficiency. While Rambe, et. al., (2022) demonstrate that fiscal decentralization enhances resource allocation in high capacity regions, other studies caution that inconsistent institutional readiness can negate these advantages, especially in large metropolitan contexts like Jakarta (Aulia & Tambun, 2025). This review's findings reflect this duality: decentralization has supported innovation and localized service improvements, but its benefits are uneven due to coordination gaps and bureaucratic disparities.

Theoretical Contributions

The study contributes to decentralization theory by illustrating the significance of contextual and institutional factors in shaping governance outcomes. It reinforces the argument that decentralization does not automatically yield efficiency; rather, its effectiveness depends on the presence of robust institutional capacity, intergovernmental coordination mechanisms, and clearly delineated authority structures (Nugroho & Sujarwoto, 2022). The findings support multilevel governance theories that emphasize the interdependence of central and local actors and challenge assumptions of linear relations between autonomy and performance.

Moreover, the review advances the theoretical discussion on asymmetric decentralization, highlighting how Jakarta's unique administrative status requires differentiated governance arrangements (Scorpio & Nursadi, 2025). This underscores the need for tailored decentralization designs in metropolitan regions with complex jurisdictional structures. Finally, the study expands conflict governance theory by demonstrating that decentralization can both mitigate and exacerbate local tensions depending on the strength of coordination, inclusivity, and institutional trust, extending insights from conflict-oriented governance frameworks (Akbar & Ahmad, 2023).

Practical Contributions

From a policy perspective, the findings highlight several priorities for improving Jakarta's decentralized governance. Strengthening institutional capacity particularly through targeted training, bureaucratic restructuring, and digital competency development is critical for ensuring that decentralization yields tangible improvements in public service delivery. Enhancing intergovernmental coordination, especially between ministries and the Jakarta Provincial Government, is essential for reducing policy overlap and improving regulatory coherence, consistent with recommendations by Lutfi & Hariyati (2020).

The results also emphasize the importance of asymmetric governance arrangements tailored to Jakarta's metropolitan complexity, suggesting revisions to legal and institutional frameworks to clarify authority distribution and improve vertical synchronization. Effective conflict management requires reinforcing participatory mechanisms such as Community Early Warning Forum, integrating interagency conflict handling teams, and increasing transparency and public communication.

In addition, digital governance initiatives particularly OSS-RBA licensing integration, e-government platforms, and data interoperability offer significant potential to streamline administrative processes and reduce inefficiencies, though their success depends on comprehensive capacity building. Urban policy areas such as relocation, infrastructure development, and environmental management must integrate socio-cultural considerations to minimize resistance and improve legitimacy (Vandito et al., 2023).

Integrated Discussion on Jakarta's Decentralization Challenges

Overall, this study shows that Jakarta's decentralization is marked by a tension between autonomy driven innovation and the structural limitations imposed by institutional fragmentation. While the city benefits from participatory governance practices, localized service responsiveness, and digital modernization, these gains are often undermined by weak coordination, ambiguous authority lines, and political contestation that disrupt policy continuity. The combination of these factors produces uneven administrative performance, inconsistent conflict management outcomes, and recurrent policy misalignment.

The contribution of this study lies in its integrated synthesis of administrative efficiency, policy dynamics, coordination mechanisms, and conflict governance, an intersection that previous research has treated only in isolation. By highlighting how these dimensions interact within Jakarta's asymmetric decentralization model, the study provides a more comprehensive understanding of the city's governance challenges and identifies opportunities for institutional reform. These insights offer a foundation for developing more coherent, context-sensitive approaches that strengthen decentralization's benefits while mitigating its institutional and political risks.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that Jakarta's decentralization framework generates both opportunities and persistent governance constraints. The synthesis of existing literature reveals that asymmetric autonomy has improved policy responsiveness in certain sectors, yet administrative efficiency remains uneven due to fragmented authority, weak vertical coordination, and inconsistent bureaucratic capacity across provincial institutions. These findings directly address the research gap identified in the introduction by showing that Jakarta's governance challenges emerge not from decentralization per se, but from structural misalignment between regulatory mandates, institutional readiness, and political dynamics.

The study contributes theoretically by refining the understanding of decentralized governance in metropolitan contexts, highlighting that asymmetric models require stronger institutional clarity and coordination mechanisms than conventional decentralization frameworks assume. It underscores that administrative efficiency is contingent not only on fiscal discretion but also on the coherence of intergovernmental relations and the integration of conflict governance into policy design. These insights strengthen decentralization theory by exposing the limits of autonomy when institutional fragmentation and political contestation are not adequately managed.

Practically, the findings suggest that Jakarta's provincial government must prioritize strengthening bureaucratic capacity, reinforcing cross-level coordination, and institutionalizing budget discipline to prevent inefficiencies in public service delivery. Community-based conflict management mechanisms should be integrated into formal decision-making to enhance legitimacy and prevent policy-induced tensions. Collectively, these measures are essential for ensuring that decentralization produces consistent policy effectiveness rather than reinforcing institutional disparities.

This review is limited by its reliance on secondary literature, which constrains the ability to capture emerging institutional dynamics or sector-specific reforms. Future research should employ empirical case studies, longitudinal institutional analyses, or comparative metropolitan studies to deepen understanding of how asymmetric decentralization can be optimized in large, politically complex urban regions. Despite these limitations, the study advances a more critical and integrated perspective on Jakarta's decentralization, offering a foundation for more coherent and context-sensitive governance reforms.

REFERENCES

- Agung, M. F. M. (2025). Strengthening governance through pentahelix collaboration: A qualitative study in the era of digital disruptions. *Journal Publicuho*, 8(3), 1619–1626. <https://doi.org/10.35817/publicuho.v8i3.873>
- Akbar, A., & Ahmad, M. (2023). Implementasi forum kewaspadaan dini masyarakat dalam menangani konflik sosial di kelurahan warakas. <https://doi.org/10.59713/projip.v2i2.666>
- Anadirga, C. N., Nurdin, N. N., & Sinurat, M. (2024). Efektivitas penanganan konflik sosial oleh tim terpadu di provinsi dki jakarta. *Jurnal Kajian Pemerintahan (Journal of Government, Social and Politics)*, 10(2), 39–48. [https://doi.org/10.25299/jkp.2024.vol10\(1\).17851](https://doi.org/10.25299/jkp.2024.vol10(1).17851)
- Apriansyah, J., Izzatusholekha, I., & Satispi, E. (2024). Implementation of groundwater usage reduction policy in south jakarta. *Publicus*, 2(1), 141–149. <https://doi.org/10.30598/publicusvol2iss1p141-149>
- Aulia, A. P., & Tambun, K. Y. (2025). Synchronization of central and regional government policies in public services. *Indonesian Journal of Public Administration Review*, 2(4), 12. <https://doi.org/10.47134/par.v2i4.4758>
- Febriandiela, F., Frinaldi, A., & Magriasti, L. (2024). Critical analysis of decentralization theory in the context of local government: A literature review. *Adabi*, 11(1), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.62066/jpab.v11i1.13>
- Guridno, E. (2024). Impact of national political dynamics on local political dynamics of the 2017 dki jakarta election. *Journal of Law and Sustainable Development*. <https://doi.org/10.55908/sdgs.v12i1.2356>
- Judijanto, L., & Datumula, S. (2024). The dynamics of legal politics in resolving regional policy conflicts. *Ipsa Jure*, 1(11), 59–69. <https://doi.org/10.62872/vzghnh13>
- Kübler, D., & Rochat, P. (2016). Fragmented governance and spatial equity in metropolitan areas. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*.
- Kusuma, R. D., Fauzi, A., Saepudin, S., & Randisa, A. R. (2023). Problems and challenges of asymmetrical democracy in Indonesia. *Kybernology : Journal of Government Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.26618/kjgs.v3i1.12059>
- Lutfi, A., & Hariyati, D. (2020). Relations between levels of government in handling the covid-19 pandemic in Indonesia: A study on relations between the central government and the provincial government of dki jakarta. <https://doi.org/10.30589/PROCEEDINGS.2020.407>

-
- Mulanda, D., Frinaldi, A., & Magriasti, L. (2024). Decentralization and public participation: A literature review on impact and implementation. *Adabi*, 11(1), 57–68. <https://doi.org/10.62066/jpab.v11i1.17>
- Nugroho, Y., & Sujarwoto. (2022). *Institutions, outputs and outcomes: Two decades of decentralization and state capacity in Indonesia*. <https://doi.org/10.1355/ae38-3b>
- Oktavia, Y., Frinaldi, A., Magriasti, L., & Naldi, H. (2025). Desentralisasi dan otonomi pemerintahan daerah: Studi literatur tentang dinamika kebijakan pemerintahan daerah pasca-reformasi. *Publicness*, 4(2), 157–165. <https://doi.org/10.24036/publicness.v4i2.260>
- Rahmatunnisa, M., Hindersah, R., & Achmad, T. H. (2018). Why regions with archipelagic characteristics in Indonesia also need asymmetric decentralization. *Journal Bina Praja: Journal of Home Affairs Governance*, 10(2), 251–261. <https://doi.org/10.21787/JBP.10.2018.251-261>
- Rambe, R. A., Alisjahbana, A., Wibowo, K., & Muljarijadi, B. (2022). Regional split and local government spending efficiency in Indonesia. *Economics, Management and Sustainability*, 7(2), 6–18. <https://doi.org/10.14254/jems.2022.7-2.1>
- Reba, Y. E. (2024). *Decentralization of power: Opportunities and challenges for regions*. <https://doi.org/10.59613/global.v2i10.344>
- Samsidar, S. (2025). Decentralization and effectiveness of regional government: Literature review on the implementation of regional autonomy in Indonesia. *Journal of Political Governance*, 2(3), 35–42. <https://doi.org/10.62872/ckrvgv80>
- Scorpio, B., & Nursadi, H. (2025). Analisis dampak adanya dewan kawasan aglomerasi dalam undang-undang nomor 2 tahun 2024 tentang provinsi daerah khusus jakarta terhadap desentralisasi pemerintah daerah. *Journal of Vision and Ideas*, 5(2). <https://doi.org/10.47467/visa.v5i2.6543>
- Sialen, N. (2024). Capacity building of the DKI Jakarta provincial government in implementing e-government. *Best Journal of Administration and Management*, 2(4), 202–209. <https://doi.org/10.56403/bejam.v2i4.190>
- Surya, I. (2024). Villages as subdistrict apparatus in the era of regional autonomy. *Pena Justisia: Media Komunikasi Dan Kajian Hukum (Edisi Elektronik)*, 22(3). <https://doi.org/10.31941/pj.v22i3.5020>
- Vandito, R. L., Tobing, A. N. L., Maha, R. A. D., Aminudin, M. A. V, & Tasyifa, K. A. (2023). Implementasi konsep kesejahteraan, kesetaraan dan keadilan sosial dalam kebijakan publik provinsi dki jakarta pada tahun 2022: Studi kasus klj dan relokasi program provinsi pada pemukiman kumuh. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik (Sekolah Tinggi Ilmu Sosial Dan Ilmu Politik Wira Bhakti)*. <https://doi.org/10.56552/jisipol.v5i1.124>
- Widhiantari, S. A. (2025). Collaborative governance in localizing the sustainable development goals (sdgs): A case study of Jakarta's regional action plan (rad). *COMSERVA*, 5(1). <https://doi.org/10.59141/comserva.v5i1.3132>
- Windiatmoko, A. D., Taufik, H., & Asropi, A. (2024). Jakarta evolution sustainability innovation with the presence of the online single submission risk-based approach system, a solution for licensing services in dki jakarta province. *Pedagogi: Jurnal Penelitian Pendidikan*, 7(2), 1–19. <https://doi.org/10.21009/jdmb.07.2.1>
- Yustianto, B. P., Epenetus, A. J., Rozika, T. F., & Syarif, A. (2025). The effect of fiscal decentralization on the performance of regional apparatus organizations. *Studi Akuntansi Keuangan Dan Manajemen*, 5(1), 161–171. <https://doi.org/10.35912/sakman.v5i1.3611>
-