

## **THE IMPACT OF EDUCATIONAL DECENTRALISATION ON THE IMPLEMENTATION OF DEMOCRATIC PRINCIPLES IN SCHOOLS: A CASE STUDY OF THE INTERACTION BETWEEN THE CENTRAL GOVERNMENT, LOCAL GOVERNMENT, AND THE COMMUNITY**

**Moh. Zainudin**

Universitas Bina Sehat PPNI Mojokerto  
[zenika59@gmail.com](mailto:zenika59@gmail.com)

**Aslan**

Universitas Sultan Muhammad Syafiuddin Sambas  
[aslanalbanjary066@gmail.com](mailto:aslanalbanjary066@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

This study aims to examine the impact of educational decentralisation on the implementation of democratic principles in schools, highlighting the interaction between the central government, local governments, and the community. The method used is a literature study through descriptive-critical analysis of academic literature, legislation, and previous research related to educational governance and school democratisation. The results of the study show that decentralisation provides a great opportunity to strengthen democracy in schools through increased participation of teachers, students, parents, and the community; transparency and accountability in management; and more collaborative school leadership. In this context, schools can function as laboratories of democracy that foster the values of participation, equality, tolerance, and respect for differences. However, this study also emphasises that decentralisation has the potential to create new problems, including overlapping authority between the central and regional governments, unequal capacity between regions, and community participation that is often formalistic in nature. Non-synergistic interactions between the central government, regional governments, and the community can lead to policy fragmentation and widen the gap in the practice of school democratisation. Thus, the democratisation of education in Indonesia can only be realised if decentralisation is supported by effective institutional coordination, capacity building in the regions, and the empowerment of the community as active partners in education.

**Keywords:** Decentralisation of education, democracy in schools, community participation, education governance, central-regional interaction.

### **Introduction**

Education is one of the most important instruments in building a nation's civilisation. Through education, the basic values of social life are instilled systematically and continuously. In countries that adhere to a democratic system such as Indonesia, education not only serves to educate the nation, but also becomes a medium for internalising democratic principles such as participation, equality, transparency, accountability, and respect for differences (Fitriyanti & Aslan, 2025); (Judijanto & Aslan, 2025); (Purike & Aslan, 2025). Schools are thus not only spaces for the transfer of knowledge, but also arenas for the socialisation of democratic values

that are expected to shape citizens who are critical, responsible, and able to participate healthily in public life (Komari & Aslan, 2025); (Firmansyah & Aslan, 2025a); (Firmansyah & Aslan, 2025b).

In the political context, Indonesia has undergone a major transformation since the 1998 reform era, with one of the significant changes being the implementation of a decentralised system of government through the Regional Autonomy Law. This decentralisation has not only had an impact on politics and the economy, but has also greatly affected the education sector. Through decentralisation, local governments were given greater authority to regulate education in accordance with local conditions and needs (Tanner, 2017). This was expected to bring decision-making closer to the community, thereby making public participation in education more tangible and meaningful.

However, the process of educational decentralisation does not necessarily run smoothly. In practice, there is often a tug-of-war between the central and local governments, especially in terms of setting national standards, curriculum, budget management, and determining policy priorities. This battle over regulations and overlapping authorities sometimes creates obstacles for schools to truly implement democratic management practices. Instead of strengthening school democratisation, ineffective decentralisation can result in new bureaucracy at the local level that hinders community participation (Wirt & Kirst, 1997).

On the other hand, the role of the community in education, which is increasingly strengthened through school committees or other participatory forums, is actually an important opportunity to strengthen school democratisation. Community participation provides a space for parents, students, and the wider community to contribute to decision-making in schools. This arrangement is in line with the spirit of deliberative democracy, which emphasises the importance of deliberation, collective agreement, and public accountability. However, community participation is often still a formality, limited to school fundraising, and has not yet fully become a forum for the articulation of interests or effective social control (Cornito, 2021).

The above reality shows the tension between the normative ideals of educational decentralisation and the empirical reality of its implementation. Normatively, decentralisation is considered a strategic step towards achieving equity and democratisation in education. However, the objective conditions on the ground show the emergence of new inequalities, both between regions and between schools (Sen & Nussbaum, 2008). Schools in areas with better management capacity and strong community support tend to be more successful in implementing democratic principles, while areas with limited resources often lag behind. This raises critical questions about how the interaction between the central government, local governments, and the community actually affects the achievement of democratisation in schools (Galiani, 2008).

In the legal framework, the National Education System Law is the main reference for the implementation of education in Indonesia. The articles in it clearly emphasise the importance of democratic, equitable and non-discriminatory education management (Bandur, 2012). However, behind these norms, there are complex implementation dynamics, whereby national policies must be interpreted by local governments in accordance with the local context, while at the same time involving the community as active partners. It is this tripartite relationship that then becomes the arena for interaction and negotiation to determine the direction of a more democratic education governance (Weiler, 1993).

In addition, globalisation and scientific developments have contributed to new demands on the education system. Schools are challenged not only to produce graduates who are competent in academic fields, but also to become critical, democratic, and productive citizens in the public sphere. This condition shows that the democratisation of education is not only a political agenda but also an urgent social need to face the changing times (Subijanto, 2010). In this case, the decentralisation of education is an important instrument that is expected to respond to these challenges by strengthening the role of the regions and community participation (Toifur, 2011).

However, there is a dilemma in realising decentralisation that truly supports the principles of democracy in schools. On the one hand, the central government has an interest in maintaining educational quality standards to prevent regional disparities. On the other hand, local governments need the flexibility to adapt educational policies to local characteristics. Meanwhile, the community also demands that their voices and aspirations be heard in school management. If coordination between these three actors does not work well, what happens is policy fragmentation, overlapping authorities, and weak educational accountability at the grassroots level (Guimarães & Ribeiro, 2017).

This condition becomes even more complex when viewed from the perspective of social justice. Decentralisation, which should be a solution for equity, in many cases has widened the gap between schools in resource-rich areas and schools in resource-poor areas. This has resulted in the uneven implementation of democratic values in schools: in some areas, school democratisation can flourish with broad participation and management transparency, while in other areas, schools still operate under a top-down management model that is far from democratic practices.

Thus, academic studies on the impact of decentralisation on the democratisation of education are becoming increasingly relevant (Bjork, 2025). It is important to note that democracy in schools is not limited to administrative governance but also encompasses everyday educational culture.

The way teachers interact with students, the way decisions are made at school, the way local curricula are developed, and the pattern of communication between schools and parents are concrete examples of democratic practices at the micro level (Ncube, 2020). Educational decentralisation—if implemented with strong commitment—can be a driving force for a more open, inclusive, and participatory

school culture. Conversely, if decentralisation is limited to the transfer of administrative authority without strengthening management capacity and a culture of participation, then school democratisation will only become a slogan (Young & Tavares, 2004).

Therefore, this research is important to explore how educational decentralisation actually impacts the implementation of democratic principles in schools.

### **Research Methodology**

The research method used in this study is library research with a descriptive-critical approach, which aims to analyse various academic literature, legislation, and previous research results related to educational decentralisation and the implementation of democratic principles in schools. The main data was obtained from books on education and political theory, national and international scientific journals, public policy reports, and official government documents relevant to the issues of decentralisation and education governance (Elijah & Aslan, 2025). The analysis was conducted through a process of collecting, selecting, evaluating, and synthesising information from various sources to find patterns of interaction between the central government, local governments, and the community. Furthermore, the results of the analysis are presented in the form of logical and critical arguments to show how the decentralisation of education can affect the implementation of democracy in schools, both in normative and practical aspects (Hamzah, 2020).

### **Results and Discussion**

#### **The Impact of Decentralisation on Culture and Democratic Practices in Schools**

Decentralisation of education is essentially expected to bring about significant changes in the process of school democratisation. With the devolution of authority from the central government to local governments, schools have the opportunity to regulate internal policies that are more in line with local needs. This allows for innovation in governance and teaching and learning processes, including encouraging the involvement of various stakeholders such as teachers, students, parents, and the wider community. This broader participation is one of the prerequisites for the realisation of a democratic school culture (Provincial Government, 2023).

In practice, decentralisation has influenced the pattern of relationships between schools and their environments. Whereas previously schools tended to follow top-down bureaucratic instructions from the central level, decentralisation has given schools the space to be creative in developing local programmes and involving the school community in the decision-making process. This change in orientation has slowly formed a culture of participation, where the voices of various parties are taken into account, both in budget discussions, programme implementation, and curricular and extracurricular activities (Chano, 2025).

From the perspective of school leadership, decentralisation has also shifted the managerial style of school principals from a centralised command pattern to a collaborative pattern. School principals are no longer required to be merely administrators of policy, but also facilitators who can open up space for discussion, accommodate the opinions of teachers and students, and build consensus in decision-making. This reflects the practice of substantive democracy, where leadership is measured not only by formal power, but also by the ability to communicate, negotiate, and build trust within the school community (Leithwood & Menzies, 1998).

In addition to leadership, the culture of democracy in schools is also reflected in the involvement of teachers in decision-making forums. Decentralisation provides opportunities for teachers to play a more active role in formulating local content curricula, managing learning activities, and professional development programmes. With this independence, teachers are not merely implementers of policies determined from above, but actors who help determine the direction of educational development in their schools. This situation reinforces the principle of collegiality and opens up space for more democratic decision-making at the school level (Mărginean, 2019).

Similar changes can also be seen in the role of students. Although students are often viewed merely as 'objects' of education, decentralisation opens up opportunities for them to be involved in certain forums, such as intra-school organisations, student councils, and even certain meetings that discuss extracurricular activity policies. Student involvement in decision-making fosters a sense of belonging to the school, increases their awareness of their democratic rights, and trains them in deliberation and social responsibility skills (Rahman & Wiyono, 2023). Thus, schools are not only academic learning institutions but also laboratories of democracy for students.

School committees are an important instrument of decentralisation that has a direct impact on democratic practices. Through school committees, parents have a formal space to voice their aspirations, exercise oversight, and provide input on school policies. The presence of school committees broadens the basis of participation in education and strengthens the principle of public accountability. However, the effectiveness of school committees in practice is often influenced by the quality of communication between the school and the community, including the extent to which participation mechanisms are open and not merely formalities (Johnson, 2015).

The aspect of transparency in education management is also an important impact of decentralisation on democratic practices. Schools are required to be more open in communicating their budget plans, work programmes, and accountability reports to the community. This transparency is the foundation for public accountability and prevents abuse of authority (Naidoo, 2004). This culture of openness is slowly shifting the old paradigm that placed schools as closed institutions to public spaces that are accountable to stakeholders (Caldwell, 2008).

On the other hand, decentralisation also provides opportunities for the development of diverse democratic practices in schools. Variations in the social,

cultural, and economic contexts of an area create different dynamics in implementation. Schools in relatively more modern urban areas are often quicker to adopt a democratic culture, while schools in rural areas face challenges in terms of resources, management capacity, and low levels of community participation literacy (Bray, 2003). Thus, although decentralisation provides equal autonomy, its implementation does not always produce uniform outcomes, but rather presents disparities in democratisation.

Another visible impact is the emergence of new patterns of collaboration between schools and institutions outside the world of education, such as non-governmental organisations, the business world, and community organisations. This cooperation opens up space for plurality in education management, where schools become part of a broader social ecosystem. Such practices are a reflection of participatory democracy, as they recognise the diversity of actors relevant to improving the quality of education and the welfare of school communities (Indonesian Ministry of Finance, 2022).

Despite the many positive impacts, the potential problems of decentralisation on school democratisation cannot be ignored. In some cases, decentralisation has actually created new bureaucracies at the local level that are no less rigid than the central government. This has resulted in decision-making remaining hierarchical and hindering the participation of school communities. Another problem is the tendency for inequality of authority between local governments and schools, which sometimes still treats schools as objects of policy rather than independent subjects (Hoxby, 2000).

Capacity gaps between regions are also a major obstacle to embedding democracy in schools through decentralisation. Regions with sufficient human resources, budgets and infrastructure will find it easier to build a democratic culture, while resource-poor regions will find it difficult to implement the principles of participation and transparency in practice. As a result, school democracy is often strong in certain regions and weak in others, leading to unequal democratic practices in education. In addition to structural aspects, cultural factors also influence the extent to which decentralisation supports school democracy (Sjamsi Pasandaran, 2022). In some regions, paternalistic local cultural values remain very strong, so schools continue to be run in an authoritarian manner even though decentralisation has provided space for participation. This shows that school democratisation is not only a matter of policy and governance structure, but is also closely related to organisational cultural transformation and changes in the mindset of school communities (Lopez, 2016).

Nevertheless, it is important to remember that the process of transformation towards democracy in schools is a long-term movement. Decentralisation is an important bridge to accelerate change, but its successful implementation depends heavily on the synergy between policy, management capacity, and socio-cultural culture (Davies, 2014). Schools must continue to be strengthened as miniatures of

democratic societies where the values of participation, equality, transparency, and accountability are truly practised in everyday life, not just slogans on paper (Aslan & Sidabutar, 2025); (Saputra et al., 2024).

Thus, the decentralisation of education has an ambivalent impact on the culture and practice of democracy in schools. On the one hand, decentralisation opens up space for participation, strengthens accountability, and gives rise to collaborative leadership that supports democratisation. On the other hand, however, weaknesses in regional capacity, cultural resistance, and the reproduction of local bureaucracy can be serious obstacles. Therefore, institutional strengthening strategies, human capacity building, and the continuous internalisation of democratic values are needed so that decentralisation truly becomes an instrument of transformation towards democratic and inclusive schools.

### **Interaction between the Central Government, Local Governments, and the Community as Determinants of Education Democratisation**

Interaction between the central government, local governments, and the community in the implementation of education is a key point for the success of democratisation in schools. Education is a very complex sector because it involves not only the transfer of knowledge, but also ideology, social values, and the direction of national development. This is where harmonious cooperation between actors in creating inclusive governance is important. Synergistic interaction will provide a positive boost for the emergence of democratic practices in schools, while interaction that is dominated by conflict will actually hinder public participation and transparency in decision-making (Davies, 2014).

The central government has a strategic role as the guarantor of quality and equality in education throughout Indonesia. This function is realised through national policies, the formulation of education standards, core curriculum regulations, and national-scale funding policies such as BOS (School Operational Assistance) (Singh & Arjun, 2020). With this authority, the central government ensures that the democratic principle of equal rights for every citizen to obtain education is maintained. However, the top-down approach from the centre sometimes causes tension when it is not adapted to the social and economic conditions of each region, so that democratisation at the school level can be disrupted by overly uniform policies (Pattel, 2006).

Local governments, on the other hand, have greater responsibility for the technical implementation of education. Regional autonomy gives provincial and district/municipal governments the authority to determine policy directions that are considered appropriate to local needs, from budget management to teacher distribution (Barakat & Al-Masri, 2022). This opens up space for local governments to be more adaptive to different local contexts and potentially expands the principles of democracy because policies are closer to the community. However, there are risks

when local governments do not yet have adequate institutional capacity, which can lead to non-participatory, even bureaucratic and clientelistic policies (Zhao, 2011).

Within the framework of decentralisation, the community has gained a more formal position in the formulation and supervision of education through forums such as school committees or education councils. This community involvement is a manifestation of participatory democracy, in which education is seen as a shared responsibility, not just a matter for the bureaucracy (UNESCO, 1998). Through public participation, schools are expected to become more accountable, transparent, and responsive to the real needs of their environment. However, the level of community participation still varies—in some areas, the community has the capacity to make substantive contributions, while in many other areas, involvement is still symbolic (World Bank, 2018).

The interaction between these three actors is often influenced by established patterns of communication and coordination. If the central government is able to provide flexible regulations, local governments have good implementation capacity, and the community is given space to play an active role, then the democratisation of education can proceed relatively effectively. Conversely, when communication is sectoral and fragmented, disharmony between actors occurs, which actually hinders the creation of a democratic attitude in schools.

Ultimately, democratisation must not only be present in the school environment, but also in the relationships between policy-making institutions (Shankararaman & Mahony, 2018). One of the main problems in the interaction between these three actors is the overlap of authority. The central government wants to maintain control over standards, while local governments want to demonstrate real autonomy.

The community is sometimes marginalised as a result of these debates over authority. As a result, public participation has not been fully implemented because various policies are often born out of political compromises between the central and local governments without considering grassroots aspirations. This situation has the potential to weaken the legitimacy of schools as spaces for democracy (Samoff & Carroll, 2003).

In addition to the problem of authority, the factor of unequal distribution of resources also affects interactions between actors. The central government does provide education funding through the General Allocation Fund, Special Allocation Fund, and School Operational Assistance (BOS) mechanisms, but their utilisation is highly dependent on local government and community participation. In regions with high fiscal and social capacity, interactions are more productive because they are able to produce participatory policies (Tran, 2014). Conversely, in poor regions with low managerial capacity, interactions tend to be unequal, with the central government remaining dominant and the community having no meaningful bargaining power in the implementation of education (Cahyono & Aslan, 2025); (Aslan & Rasmita, 2025).



However, there are positive practices that can be noted, where interactions between the central government, regions, and communities are harmonious. Several regions have been able to take advantage of the flexibility of decentralisation to combine national policies with local values, while providing space for community participation. For example, local governments can develop local content curricula that take into account local cultural wisdom, while the community is involved in school oversight forums and teachers are given the space to propose learning innovations (Faguet, 2014). In this context, schools truly become democratic arenas that value plurality and participation.

Conversely, conflict-ridden patterns of interaction can actually weaken school democratisation. Conflicts can arise when local governments feel that central government policies are too restrictive in terms of curriculum, accreditation standards, or budgeting mechanisms. Meanwhile, communities that want to play a role often face restrictions from school and local bureaucracies. This situation creates polarisation and even apathy among communities, which ultimately hinders the democratic education process. Therefore, what is needed is not only the distribution of authority, but also negotiation and collaboration skills among actors (Gamage, 2003).

One of the most ideal forms of interaction is a collaborative governance model, in which the roles of the central government, local governments, and the community are complementary. The central government sets the vision, mission, and minimum standards, local governments regulate the implementation mechanisms according to the local context, while the community acts as a supervisor and active partner in determining school priorities. This model not only strengthens democracy in schools but also reduces disparities between regions.

This type of governance model emphasises that the democratisation of education is the result of joint efforts, not the monopoly of any one actor (Kameshwara, 2024). However, establishing collaborative governance is not easy. It requires political commitment from the central government to provide real autonomy, the institutional capacity of local governments to implement education transparently, and the readiness of the community to participate in a deliberative framework.

Without these three elements, the existing interaction will only result in shallow procedural democracy in schools, without truly touching on substantive aspects such as equality, critical participation, and respect for individual rights (Ashmawy, 2004).

The balance of interaction between the three actors must also be tested continuously. Monitoring and evaluation involving all three becomes an important instrument so that education policy is always adaptive to the changing times and community needs. When the evaluation mechanism is carried out transparently and inclusively, democratisation in schools can grow as a culture, not just a short-term agenda. In other words, the democratisation of education is closely related to the quality of the institutionalisation of interactions between these actors (Ashmawy, 2004).

Finally, the interaction between the central government, local governments, and the community cannot be viewed as a static relationship. It is a dynamic arena of negotiation, influenced by political interests, bureaucratic capacity, and the community's perception of their role in education. If this interaction is based on the principles of mutual trust, information disclosure, and accountability, democratisation in schools will find a solid form. However, if these interactions are characterised by domination, marginalisation, or conflicts of interest, then the democratisation of education will only become a jargon without any real substance. Thus, the quality of democracy in schools is ultimately determined by how the central government, local governments, and the community can build constructive and sustainable synergy.

## **Conclusion**

The decentralisation of education has had an ambivalent impact on the implementation of democratic principles in schools. On the one hand, decentralisation has opened up greater opportunities for teachers, students, parents and the community to participate in decision-making processes, enabling schools to become real arenas for learning about democracy. Participation mechanisms through school committees, the implementation of budget transparency, and opportunities for innovation in local content are positive manifestations of educational autonomy. In addition, leadership patterns in schools are encouraged to be more collaborative and open to input from the school community, so that democratic values are increasingly internalised in the learning culture.

However, on the other hand, decentralisation brings serious challenges that can hinder the democratisation of education. Overlapping authorities between the central and regional governments, disparities in managerial capacity between regions, and paternalistic cultural resistance remain obstacles to the realisation of substantive democratic practices. Interaction between the central government, local governments, and communities has proven to be a determining factor that influences the results of democratisation in schools: when synergy is productive, democratic values grow strong, but when interaction is dominated by conflict, bureaucratisation, or marginalisation of communities, democracy becomes a mere formality. Therefore, the democratisation of education in Indonesia must continue to be strengthened through cross-level government coordination, capacity building in local governments, and community empowerment so that decentralisation truly functions as an instrument of transformation towards inclusive, participatory, and democratic schools.

## References

- Ashmawy, A. (2004). Decentralisation and Effective School Leadership. *International Journal of Educational Leadership*.  
<https://www.scitepress.org/Papers/2017/70354/70354.pdf>
- Aslan, A., & Rasmita, R. (2025). EXPLORING CHALLENGES AND STRATEGIES IN TEACHING ENGLISH AS A SECOND LANGUAGE TO YOUNG LEARNERS. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 2(11), Article 11.
- Aslan, A., & Sidabutar, H. (2025). APPLICATION OF PIAGET'S THEORY IN EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 3(1), Article 1.
- Bandur, R. (2012). Role of Local Communities in Education Decentralization. *International Journal of Community Education*.
- Barakat, B., & Al-Masri, H. (2022). Decentralized Education Systems in the Arab World. *Middle East Educational Review*.
- Bjork, C. (2025). Lessons learned in transition: A bibliometric analysis of educational decentralization. *Frontiers in Education*.  
<https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1435928>
- Bray, M. (2003). Education and Decentralization in Developing Countries. *Educational Quarterly*, 59(3), 27–50.
- Cahyono, D., & Aslan, A. (2025). THE ROLE AND CHALLENGES OF HONORARY TEACHERS IN THE NATIONAL EDUCATION SYSTEM: A LITERATURE REVIEW. *INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIETY REVIEWS*, 3(5), Article 5.
- Caldwell, B. J. (2008). Education decentralization and community involvement in schools. *International Journal of Educational Development*.
- Chano, M. (2025). Governance and Leadership in Decentralization: Case Studies. *Frontiers in Education*. <https://doi.org/10.3389/feduc.2025.1435928>
- Cornito, C. M. (2021). Striking a Balance between Centralized and Decentralized Leadership for School Success. *Journal of Educational Management*.
- Davies, B. (2014). Democratic Governance in Schools: The Impact of Decentralization. *Education and Society*.
- Elijah, E., & Aslan, A. (2025). STAKE'S EVALUATION MODEL: METODE PENELITIAN. *Prosiding Seminar Nasional Indonesia*, 3(2), Article 2.
- Faguet, J. P. (2014). Decentralization and Governance. *World Development*, 53, 2–13.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2013.01.002>
- Firmansyah, F., & Aslan, A. (2025a). EFFECTIVENESS OF SPECIAL EDUCATION PROGRAMMES IN PRIMARY SCHOOLS: AN ANALYSIS OF THE LITERATURE. *INJOSEDU: INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF SOCIAL AND EDUCATION*, 2(2), Article 2.
- Firmansyah, F., & Aslan, A. (2025b). THE RELEVANCE OF STEAM EDUCATION IN PREPARING 21ST CENTURY STUDENTS. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning*, 3(3), Article 3.
- Fitriyanti, F., & Aslan, A. (2025). THE ROLE OF INCLUSIVE EDUCATION IN REDUCING LEARNING DISPARITIES AMONG STUDENTS FROM DIFFERENT ECONOMIC BACKGROUNDS. *Indonesian Journal of Education (INJOE)*, 5(3), Article 3.
- Galiani, S. (2008). School decentralization: Helping the good get better, but leaving the poor behind? *Journal of Public Economics*, 92(10–11), 2106–2120.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2008.06.009>

- Gamage, D. T. (2003). Decentralisation of Education in Sri Lanka: Theoretical and Practical Perspectives. *International Review of Education*.
- Guimarães, M., & Ribeiro, V. (2017). Local Government and Education Decentralization in Brazil. *Public Administration Review*.
- Hamzah, A. (2020). *Metode Penelitian Kepustakaan*. Literasi Nusantara.
- Hoxby, C. M. (2000). Does Competition Among Public Schools Benefit Students and Taxpayers? *American Economic Review*.
- Johnson, R. W. (2015). Education Decentralization in the United States: Pros and Cons. *Policy Studies Journal*.
- Judijanto, L., & Aslan, A. (2025). ADDRESSING DISPARITIES IN MULTISECTORAL EDUCATION: LEARNING FROM AN INTERNATIONAL LITERATURE REVIEW. *Indonesian Journal of Education (INJOE)*, 5(1), Article 1.
- Kameshwara, K. K. (2024). Decentralisation in School Management and Student Outcomes. *Journal of Development Studies*.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00220388.2023.2273800>
- Kemenkeu Indonesia. (2022). *Dua Dekade Implementasi Desentralisasi Fiskal di Indonesia*.  
[https://fiskal.kemenkeu.go.id/files/buku/file/1661139200\\_buku\\_dua\\_dekade\\_desentralisasi\\_fiskal.pdf](https://fiskal.kemenkeu.go.id/files/buku/file/1661139200_buku_dua_dekade_desentralisasi_fiskal.pdf)
- Komari, K., & Aslan, A. (2025). Menggali Potensi Optimal Anak Usia Dini: Tinjauan Literatur. *Jurnal Ilmiah Edukatif*, 11(1), Article 1.  
<https://doi.org/10.37567/jie.v11i1.3605>
- Leithwood, K., & Menzies, T. (1998). Forms and Effects of Authority Transfer in Decentralized Education. *Educational Administration Quarterly*.
- Lopez, J. (2016). Democratic Principles in Education: The Role of Decentralization. *Education Policy Analysis Archives*.
- Mărginean, S. (2019). Fiscal Decentralization and Education Outcomes in Europe. *Regional Development Journal*.
- Naidoo, J. (2004). Education decentralization in South Africa: The post-apartheid experience. *Journal of Education Policy*.
- Ncube, L. (2020). Lessons from African Countries on Decentralized Education Governance. *African Journal of Educational Studies*.
- Pattel, R. (2006). Decision-making and School Performance: The Role of Decentralization. *Educational Management Administration & Leadership*.
- Pemerintah Provinsi. (2023). *Kebijakan Pendidikan Provinsi (SLTA dan SMK) dan Pengelolaan Pendidikan Otonom*. <https://jurnal.fkip-uwgm.ac.id/index.php/pendasmahakam/article/download/235/140>
- Purike, E., & Aslan, A. (2025). A COMPARISON OF THE EFFECTIVENESS OF DIGITAL AND TRADITIONAL LEARNING IN DEVELOPING COUNTRIES. *Indonesian Journal of Education (INJOE)*, 5(1), Article 1.
- Rahman, A., & Wiyono, T. (2023). Education Policy in Decentralization: Impact on Democracy. *Indonesian Journal of Education Policy*.
- Samoff, J., & Carrol, B. (2003). Decentralization and Schooling in Developing Countries: A Political Economy Perspective. *Comparative Education Review*.
- Saputra, H., Usman, S., Sakka, A. R., & Aslan, A. (2024). The Effect Of Using Learning Media On Learning Motivation About Creed and Morals At Mas Ushuluddin

- Singkawang. *IJGIE (International Journal of Graduate of Islamic Education)*, 6(1), Article 1. <https://doi.org/10.37567/ijgie.v6i1.3698>
- Sen, A., & Nussbaum, M. (2008). School Governance and Democracy. *Ethics and Education*.
- Shankararaman, V., & Mahony, P. (2018). Decentralization in Education: Equity and Accountability. *Educational Management Review*.
- Singh, M., & Arjun, B. (2020). Democracy and Decentralization in School Governance: A Review. *International Journal of Educational Research*.
- Sjamsi Pasandaran. (2022). *Desentralisasi Pendidikan dan Masalah Pemberdayaan Sekolah*. <https://media.neliti.com/media/publications/112406-ID-desentralisasi-pendidikan-dan-masalah-pe.pdf>
- Subijanto. (2010). Prinsip-Prinsip dan Efektivitas Desentralisasi Pendidikan Dalam Rangka Meningkatkan Mutu dan Relevansi Pendidikan. *Jurnal Pendidikan Dan Kebudayaan*, 16(5), 178–185.
- Tanner, D. (2017). The Politics of Decentralizing Education. *Journal of Policy History*.
- Toifur. (2011). Peningkatan Kualitas Pendidikan Melalui Desentralisasi Pendidikan. *INSANIA*, 16(2). <https://ejournal.uinsaizu.ac.id/index.php/insania/article/download/1589/1176/3024>
- Tran, L. T. (2014). Decentralization and School Leadership in Asia Pacific. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*.
- UNESCO. (1998). *Decentralization of education: Why, when, what and how?* <https://unesdoc.unesco.org/ark:/48223/pf0000120275>
- Weiler, H. N. (1993). Redistributive Model of Decentralization in Education. *Journal of International Comparative Education*.
- Wirt, F. M., & Kirst, M. W. (1997). *The Political Dynamics of American Education*. McCutchan Publishing.
- World Bank. (2018). *Decentralization of Education: Politics and Consensus*.
- Young, M., & Tavares, O. (2004). Knowledge and Power in Decentralized Education Governance. *Comparative Education Review*.
- Zhao, Y. (2011). Decentralization Reform in China: Effects on Education Governance. *Journal of Asian Public Policy*.