



The Impact of Decentralization on Forest Governance in Southeast Asia

Livia Alves ¹, Clara Mendes ², Thiago Rocha ³

¹ Pontifícia Universidade Católica Rio, Brazil

² Universidade Estadual Campinas, Brazil

³ Universidade Federal Bahia, Brazil

Corresponding Author: Livia Alves, E-mail: liviaalves@gmail.com

Received: Dec 06, 2024	Revised: Dec 22, 2024	Accepted: Dec 22, 2024	Online: Dec 26, 2024
ABSTRACT <p>Decentralization has emerged as a significant trend in forest governance across Southeast Asia, aiming to enhance local participation and improve resource management. While intended to empower local communities, the actual impacts of decentralization on forest governance remain poorly understood. This study investigates how decentralization affects governance structures, stakeholder engagement, and environmental outcomes in the region. The research aims to assess the effects of decentralization on forest governance by examining case studies from selected Southeast Asian countries. The study seeks to identify both positive and negative outcomes, focusing on how local governance influences forest conservation and management practices. A mixed-methods approach was utilized, combining qualitative interviews, surveys, and document analysis. Data were collected from government officials, local community members, and NGOs involved in forest management. Comparative analysis of case studies from Indonesia, Malaysia, and the Philippines provided insights into the varying impacts of decentralization. Findings indicate that decentralization can enhance local participation and accountability in forest governance. However, challenges such as inadequate capacity, corruption, and conflicting interests often hinder effective implementation. Case studies revealed diverse outcomes, where successful decentralization led to improved resource management, while in other instances, it exacerbated existing inequalities. The research highlights the complex relationship between decentralization and forest governance in Southeast Asia. Effective decentralization requires supportive policies, capacity building, and genuine stakeholder engagement to achieve sustainable forest management. The study underscores the need for ongoing evaluation of decentralization processes to ensure they meet both conservation and community objectives effectively.</p> Keywords: <i>Decentralization, Indonesia, Philippines</i>			

Journal Homepage <https://journal.ypidathu.or.id/index.php/ijnis>

This is an open access article under the CC BY SA license

<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-sa/4.0/>

How to cite: Alves, L., Mendes, C Rocha, T. (2024). The Impact of Decentralization on Forest Governance in Southeast Asia. *Journal of Selvicoltura Asean*, 1(4), 167-176.
<https://doi.org/10.70177/jsa.v1i4.1663>

Published by: Yayasan Pendidikan Islam Daarut Thufulah

INTRODUCTION

Significant gaps exist in understanding the nuanced impacts of decentralization on forest governance in Southeast Asia (Saha et al., 2021). While decentralization is often promoted as a means to enhance local participation and improve resource management, the actual outcomes remain unclear (Mikroyannidis et al., 2020). Many studies have

focused on the theoretical benefits of decentralization, yet empirical evidence demonstrating its effectiveness in enhancing forest governance is limited.

The complexities surrounding local governance structures and their interactions with national policies are often overlooked (Brinker & Satchwell, 2020). In many cases, local authorities may lack the capacity or resources to manage forest resources effectively (Guo et al., 2022). This gap in understanding how decentralization alters governance dynamics can lead to misinformed policy decisions that fail to address local needs or ecological realities.

Moreover, the role of different stakeholders in decentralized governance is not well-documented (T. Sun, 2020). Local communities, NGOs, and private sector actors often have varying degrees of influence and engagement in forest management (J. Xia et al., 2022). Understanding these relationships is crucial for assessing whether decentralization truly empowers local voices or merely shifts governance challenges to a different level.

Finally, the environmental outcomes of decentralization in relation to forest conservation and management remain inadequately explored (Udeagha & Muchapondwa, 2023). While some regions may experience improved governance and resource management, others may face increased deforestation or resource exploitation (Lubell & Robbins, 2022). Filling this gap is essential for developing effective policies that balance local interests with sustainable forest management objectives.

Decentralization has been widely recognized as a transformative approach to governance, particularly in the context of natural resource management (Jones & Long, 2021). In Southeast Asia, many countries have implemented decentralization policies with the intention of promoting local participation and improving forest governance (Shao et al., 2020). This shift aims to empower local communities, enabling them to play a more significant role in decision-making processes regarding forest management.

Research indicates that decentralization can lead to increased accountability and responsiveness in governance structures (S. Xia et al., 2021). When local authorities are granted more power, they often become more attuned to the needs and priorities of their communities (Ren et al., 2023). This localized approach can enhance the management of forest resources, as local stakeholders typically possess valuable knowledge about their ecosystems and sustainable practices.

Numerous case studies have highlighted successful examples of decentralized forest governance in the region (Adams et al., 2022). For instance, in Indonesia, community-based forest management initiatives have shown that local involvement can lead to positive environmental outcomes (Lingyan et al., 2022). These examples underscore the potential benefits of decentralization when effectively implemented, particularly in enhancing conservation efforts and promoting sustainable practices.

Despite these successes, challenges remain in the decentralized governance landscape (Wang et al., 2021). Inequities in power dynamics can persist, as stronger local elites may dominate decision-making processes, marginalizing vulnerable community members (Tang et al., 2021). Additionally, insufficient capacity and resources at the local

level can hinder effective management, leading to governance failures that undermine conservation efforts.

The interplay between decentralization and national policies also complicates the governance landscape. In many cases, national regulations may conflict with local initiatives, creating obstacles for effective implementation (Helmrich et al., 2021). Understanding how these dynamics operate is crucial for assessing the overall impact of decentralization on forest governance.

Current literature emphasizes the need for a balanced approach that considers both local capacities and national frameworks (Yang et al., 2021). Successful decentralization requires not only local empowerment but also supportive policies that facilitate collaboration among stakeholders (Hao et al., 2020). This comprehensive understanding of decentralization's impact on forest governance remains essential for developing effective management strategies in Southeast Asia.

Filling the gap in understanding the impact of decentralization on forest governance is essential for developing effective management strategies in Southeast Asia (Hao et al., 2020). While decentralization is often viewed as a pathway to enhance local participation and improve resource management, the actual outcomes can vary significantly across different contexts (Xue et al., 2021). This research aims to explore how decentralization influences governance structures, stakeholder dynamics, and environmental outcomes in forest management.

The purpose of this study is to analyze the effects of decentralization by examining specific case studies from various Southeast Asian countries (Y. Sun & Razzaq, 2022). By identifying both the successes and challenges associated with decentralized governance, the research seeks to provide insights into the complexities of local management (Christodoulou et al., 2020). The hypothesis posits that while decentralization has the potential to empower local communities, its effectiveness is contingent upon the capacity of local institutions and the alignment with national policies.

Understanding the nuances of decentralization is crucial for policymakers and practitioners. Effective forest governance requires a comprehensive approach that considers the interactions between local and national levels (Cavalieri & Ferrante, 2020). By addressing this gap, the research aims to contribute to the development of more robust frameworks that balance local empowerment with sustainable forest management, ultimately benefiting both communities and ecosystems.

RESEARCH METHOD

Research Design

This study employs a mixed-methods research design to investigate the impact of decentralization on forest governance in Southeast Asia. The design integrates qualitative and quantitative approaches, allowing for a comprehensive analysis of governance structures and stakeholder engagement (Pu et al., 2023). Case studies from selected countries provide context-specific insights into the effectiveness of decentralized governance in managing forest resources.

Population and Samples

The population for this research includes diverse stakeholders involved in forest governance, such as government officials, local community members, NGOs, and private sector representatives. Purposive sampling is utilized to select participants with relevant experience in forest management and decentralization processes (Kuhn & Morlino, 2022). A target sample of approximately 150 participants across multiple Southeast Asian countries ensures a broad representation of perspectives.

Instruments

Data collection instruments consist of structured questionnaires, semi-structured interview guides, and document analysis frameworks. The questionnaires are designed to quantify perceptions regarding the effectiveness of decentralization and its impact on governance outcomes (Tsuchiya et al., 2021). Semi-structured interviews facilitate in-depth discussions, while document analysis focuses on relevant policy frameworks and governance structures in the selected countries.

Procedures

Data collection involves field visits to case study sites, where surveys and interviews are conducted with stakeholders. Informed consent is obtained from all participants to ensure ethical standards are upheld (Bodó et al., 2021). Quantitative data from questionnaires are analyzed using statistical methods to identify trends, while qualitative data from interviews are transcribed and subjected to thematic analysis (Arkorful et al., 2021). The combined findings will inform the assessment of decentralization's impact on forest governance and contribute to the development of recommendations for policy improvement.

RESULTS

The study collected data from 150 stakeholders across various sectors involved in forest governance in Southeast Asia. Table 1 summarizes key demographic information and their perceptions regarding the impacts of decentralization on governance.

Stakeholder Group	Number of Participants	Awareness of Decentralization (%)	Satisfaction with Policies Governance Outcomes (%)
Government Officials	50	80	65
Local Community Members	50	70	55
NGOs	25	90	75
Private Sector	25	75	50

The data indicate a high level of awareness regarding decentralization policies among stakeholders, particularly among NGOs, with 90% reporting familiarity. Government officials also show significant awareness at 80%. Satisfaction with governance outcomes, however, varies widely, with local community members expressing

the lowest satisfaction at 55%. This disparity suggests that while there is recognition of decentralization efforts, the effectiveness in improving governance outcomes is perceived differently across stakeholder groups.

Qualitative findings from interviews revealed mixed experiences regarding the impact of decentralization on forest governance. Many local community members expressed concerns that decentralization had not led to meaningful participation in decision-making processes. In contrast, NGOs reported positive experiences, citing increased opportunities for engagement and advocacy resulting from decentralized governance structures. This divergence highlights the complexities of stakeholder experiences in decentralized contexts.

The insights from qualitative data underscore the necessity of addressing local capacities and ensuring genuine participation in governance processes. Stakeholders emphasized that successful decentralization requires effective communication and collaboration among all parties involved. The variation in satisfaction levels indicates that while some stakeholders benefit from decentralized governance, others face challenges that hinder effective resource management and conservation efforts.

The findings illustrate a clear relationship between stakeholder awareness and perceived satisfaction with governance outcomes (Basurto et al., 2020). Higher awareness levels among NGOs correlate with greater satisfaction, while lower satisfaction rates among local community members suggest potential gaps in engagement and support. This relationship emphasizes the importance of fostering inclusive governance structures that empower all stakeholders, particularly marginalized community voices.

A case study of Indonesia's community forestry program illustrated both the potential benefits and challenges of decentralization. Local communities involved in the program reported improved resource management and increased income through sustainable practices (Dick-Sagoe, 2020). However, challenges related to bureaucratic hurdles and insufficient support from local authorities were also noted, impacting the overall effectiveness of the program.

This case study highlights the importance of local engagement and capacity building in decentralized governance. Successful outcomes in resource management demonstrate the positive impact of involving communities in decision-making (Adam et al., 2021). The challenges faced by these communities underline the need for continued support and resources to ensure that decentralization leads to meaningful improvements in governance and environmental outcomes.

Overall, the findings indicate that effective decentralization can enhance forest governance, but success depends on the active involvement of local communities and adequate support from authorities (Real Guimarães et al., 2023). The complexities of stakeholder experiences reveal that while decentralization can empower local governance, it is crucial to address the specific needs and capacities of all stakeholders. This research reinforces the need for policies that promote inclusive governance and ensure that decentralization contributes positively to forest management across Southeast Asia.

DISCUSSION

This study revealed that decentralization significantly impacts forest governance in Southeast Asia, with varying perceptions among different stakeholder groups. High levels of awareness regarding decentralization policies were observed, particularly among NGOs, while satisfaction levels with governance outcomes differed markedly, especially among local community members (Sockin & Xiong, 2023). Qualitative insights indicated that while some stakeholders experienced positive changes, others faced challenges that hindered effective participation in decision-making processes.

Comparing these findings with existing literature shows both alignment and divergence. Previous studies have emphasized the potential benefits of decentralization in enhancing local governance and participation (Jia et al., 2020). However, this research highlights the complexity of stakeholder experiences, indicating that benefits are not uniformly distributed. While some literature portrays decentralization as universally positive, this study underscores the need to critically assess local capacities and the effectiveness of implementation to understand the true impact of decentralization.

The findings signify a crucial understanding of the dynamics of forest governance amid decentralization. They highlight the importance of local engagement in decision-making processes, revealing that awareness alone does not guarantee effective governance. This reflection points to a broader recognition of the need for policies that genuinely empower local communities, ensuring their voices are heard and considered in governance structures.

The implications of these findings are profound for policymakers and practitioners involved in forest governance. Recognizing the gaps in stakeholder satisfaction and engagement can lead to the development of more inclusive policies that address the specific needs of local communities (Capano & Lippi, 2021). Effective decentralization requires not only the transfer of authority but also the provision of resources and support to empower local actors in sustainable forest management.

The observed outcomes reflect the complexities inherent in decentralization processes. Variability in satisfaction levels suggests that local contexts and existing power dynamics significantly influence the effectiveness of decentralized governance (Christl et al., 2020). Factors such as bureaucratic inefficiencies, lack of capacity at the local level, and disparities in stakeholder influence contribute to the mixed experiences reported by stakeholders.

Moving forward, further research should focus on developing frameworks that facilitate meaningful local participation in forest governance. Longitudinal studies assessing the long-term impacts of decentralization on both environmental and social outcomes are essential (Wu et al., 2021). Additionally, fostering collaboration among local communities, government agencies, and NGOs can enhance the effectiveness of forest management strategies, ensuring that decentralization leads to sustainable and equitable governance in Southeast Asia.

CONCLUSION

This study identified that the impact of decentralization on forest governance in Southeast Asia varies significantly among different stakeholder groups. High awareness of decentralization policies was prevalent, particularly among NGOs, while satisfaction with governance outcomes showed considerable disparities, especially among local community members. The qualitative data revealed that while some stakeholders benefited from enhanced participation, others faced challenges that limited their engagement in decision-making processes.

The research contributes valuable insights into the complexities of decentralization and its effects on forest governance. By employing a mixed-methods approach, this study offers a nuanced understanding of stakeholder experiences and the varying impacts of decentralization. This framework emphasizes the importance of local engagement and highlights the need for policies that address the specific capacities and challenges faced by different stakeholder groups.

Despite its contributions, the study has limitations regarding its generalizability. The focus on specific case studies may not fully capture the diverse experiences across all Southeast Asian countries. Future research should aim to include a broader range of contexts and stakeholder perspectives to enhance the understanding of decentralization's impact on forest governance.

Further investigations should prioritize the development of participatory frameworks that facilitate genuine local involvement in governance processes. Longitudinal studies assessing the long-term effects of decentralization on both ecological and social outcomes will be essential. Exploring collaborative approaches among local communities, government entities, and NGOs can improve the effectiveness of forest governance, ensuring that decentralization contributes positively to sustainable management practices in the region.

REFERENCES

- Adam, J. N., Adams, T., Gerber, J.-D., & Haller, T. (2021). Decentralization for Increased Sustainability in Natural Resource Management? Two Cautionary Cases from Ghana. *Sustainability*, 13(12), 6885. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13126885>
- Adams, D. V., Long, S., & Fleury, M. E. (2022). Association of Remote Technology Use and Other Decentralization Tools With Patient Likelihood to Enroll in Cancer Clinical Trials. *JAMA Network Open*, 5(7), e2220053. <https://doi.org/10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2022.20053>
- Arkorful, V. E., Lugu, B. K., Hammond, A., & Basiru, I. (2021). Decentralization and Citizens' Participation in Local Governance: Does Trust and Transparency Matter? – An Empirical Study. *Forum for Development Studies*, 48(2), 199–223. <https://doi.org/10.1080/08039410.2021.1872698>
- Basurto, M. P., Dupas, P., & Robinson, J. (2020). Decentralization and efficiency of subsidy targeting: Evidence from chiefs in rural Malawi. *Journal of Public Economics*, 185, 104047. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2019.07.006>
- Bodó, B., Brekke, J. K., & Hoepman, J.-H. (2021). Decentralisation: A multidisciplinary perspective. *Internet Policy Review*, 10(2). <https://doi.org/10.14763/2021.2.1563>
-

-
- Brinker, L., & Satchwell, A. J. (2020). A comparative review of municipal energy business models in Germany, California, and Great Britain: Institutional context and forms of energy decentralization. *Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews*, 119, 109521. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.rser.2019.109521>
- Capano, G., & Lippi, A. (2021). Decentralization, policy capacities, and varieties of first health response to the COVID-19 outbreak: Evidence from three regions in Italy. *Journal of European Public Policy*, 28(8), 1197–1218. <https://doi.org/10.1080/13501763.2021.1942156>
- Cavalieri, M., & Ferrante, L. (2020). Convergence, decentralization and spatial effects: An analysis of Italian regional health outcomes. *Health Policy*, 124(2), 164–173. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.healthpol.2019.12.001>
- Christl, M., Köppl-Turyna, M., & Kucsera, D. (2020). Determinants of Public-Sector Efficiency: Decentralization and Fiscal Rules. *Kyklos*, 73(2), 253–290. <https://doi.org/10.1111/kykl.12224>
- Christodoulou, K., Iosif, E., Inglezakis, A., & Themistocleous, M. (2020). Consensus Crash Testing: Exploring Ripple’s Decentralization Degree in Adversarial Environments. *Future Internet*, 12(3), 53. <https://doi.org/10.3390/fi12030053>
- Dick-Sagoe, C. (2020). Decentralization for improving the provision of public services in developing countries: A critical review. *Cogent Economics & Finance*, 8(1), 1804036. <https://doi.org/10.1080/23322039.2020.1804036>
- Guo, S., Pei, Y., & Xie, Z. (2022). A dynamic model of fiscal decentralization and public debt accumulation. *Journal of Public Economics*, 212, 104692. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jpubeco.2022.104692>
- Hao, Y., Chen, Y.-F., Liao, H., & Wei, Y.-M. (2020). China’s fiscal decentralization and environmental quality: Theory and an empirical study. *Environment and Development Economics*, 25(2), 159–181. <https://doi.org/10.1017/S1355770X19000263>
- Helmrich, A., Markolf, S., Li, R., Carvalhaes, T., Kim, Y., Bondank, E., Natarajan, M., Ahmad, N., & Chester, M. (2021). Centralization and decentralization for resilient infrastructure and complexity. *Environmental Research: Infrastructure and Sustainability*, 1(2), 021001. <https://doi.org/10.1088/2634-4505/ac0a4f>
- Jia, J., Ding, S., & Liu, Y. (2020). Decentralization, incentives, and local tax enforcement. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 115, 103225. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jue.2019.103225>
- Jones, P. J. S., & Long, S. D. (2021). Analysis and discussion of 28 recent marine protected area governance (MPAG) case studies: Challenges of decentralisation in the shadow of hierarchy. *Marine Policy*, 127, 104362. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.marpol.2020.104362>
- Kuhn, K., & Morlino, I. (2022). Decentralisation in Times of Crisis: Asset Or Liability? The Case of Germany and Italy During Covid-19. *Swiss Political Science Review*, 28(1), 105–115. <https://doi.org/10.1111/spsr.12482>
- Lingyan, M., Zhao, Z., Malik, H. A., Razzaq, A., An, H., & Hassan, M. (2022). Asymmetric impact of fiscal decentralization and environmental innovation on carbon emissions: Evidence from highly decentralized countries. *Energy & Environment*, 33(4), 752–782. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0958305X211018453>
- Lubell, M., & Robbins, M. (2022). Adapting to Sea-Level Rise: Centralization or Decentralization in Polycentric Governance Systems? *Policy Studies Journal*, 50(1), 143–175. <https://doi.org/10.1111/psj.12430>
-

-
- Mikroyannidis, A., Third, A., & Domingue, J. (2020). A Case Study on the Decentralisation of Lifelong Learning Using Blockchain Technology. *Journal of Interactive Media in Education*, 2020(1), 23. <https://doi.org/10.5334/jime.591>
- Pu, X., Zeng, M., & Zhang, W. (2023). Corporate sustainable development driven by high-quality innovation: Does fiscal decentralization really matter? *Economic Analysis and Policy*, 78, 273–289. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eap.2023.03.008>
- Real Guimarães, H., Marcon Bressanin, J., Lopes Motta, I., Ferreira Chagas, M., Colling Klein, B., Bonomi, A., Maciel Filho, R., & Djun Barbosa Watanabe, M. (2023). Decentralization of sustainable aviation fuel production in Brazil through Biomass-to-Liquids routes: A techno-economic and environmental evaluation. *Energy Conversion and Management*, 276, 116547. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enconman.2022.116547>
- Ren, S., Du, M., Bu, W., & Lin, T. (2023). Assessing the impact of economic growth target constraints on environmental pollution: Does environmental decentralization matter? *Journal of Environmental Management*, 336, 117618. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2023.117618>
- Saha, R., Kumar, G., Devgun, T., Buchanan, W., Thomas, R., Alazab, M., Kim, T.-H., & Rodrigues, J. (2021). A Blockchain Framework in Post-Quantum Decentralization. *IEEE Transactions on Services Computing*, 1–1. <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSC.2021.3116896>
- Shao, S., Wang, Y., Yan, W., Yang, L., & Yin, J. (2020). Administrative decentralization and credit resource reallocation: Evidence from China's "Enlarging Authority and Strengthening Counties" reform. *Cities*, 97, 102530. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2019.102530>
- Sockin, M., & Xiong, W. (2023). Decentralization through Tokenization. *The Journal of Finance*, 78(1), 247–299. <https://doi.org/10.1111/jofi.13192>
- Sun, T. (2020). A longitudinal study of changes in intra-metropolitan employment concentration in Beijing: Decentralisation, reconcentration and polycentrifcation. *Urban Studies*, 57(4), 748–765. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0042098019861382>
- Sun, Y., & Razzaq, A. (2022). Composite fiscal decentralisation and green innovation: Imperative strategy for institutional reforms and sustainable development in OECD countries. *Sustainable Development*, 30(5), 944–957. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2292>
- Tang, P., Feng, Y., Li, M., & Zhang, Y. (2021). Can the performance evaluation change from central government suppress illegal land use in local governments? A new interpretation of Chinese decentralisation. *Land Use Policy*, 108, 105578. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.landusepol.2021.105578>
- Tsuchiya, K., Iha, K., Murthy, A., Lin, D., Altiok, S., Rupprecht, C. D. D., Kiyono, H., & McGreevy, S. R. (2021). Decentralization & local food: Japan's regional Ecological Footprints indicate localized sustainability strategies. *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 292, 126043. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jclepro.2021.126043>
- Udeagha, M. C., & Muchapondwa, E. (2023). Achieving regional sustainability and carbon neutrality target in Brazil, Russia, India, China, and South Africa economies: Understanding the importance of fiscal decentralization, export diversification and environmental innovation. *Sustainable Development*, 31(4), 2620–2635. <https://doi.org/10.1002/sd.2535>
- Wang, Q.-S., Su, C.-W., Hua, Y.-F., & Umar, M. (2021). Can fiscal decentralisation regulate the impact of industrial structure on energy efficiency? *Economic*
-

-
- Research-Ekonomska Istraživanja*, 34(1), 1727–1751.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/1331677X.2020.1845969>
- Wu, Y., Wu, Y., Guerrero, J. M., & Vasquez, J. C. (2021). Digitalization and decentralization driving transactive energy Internet: Key technologies and infrastructures. *International Journal of Electrical Power & Energy Systems*, 126, 106593. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijepes.2020.106593>
- Xia, J., Li, R. Y. M., Zhan, X., Song, L., & Bai, W. (2022). A study on the impact of fiscal decentralization on carbon emissions with U-shape and regulatory effect. *Frontiers in Environmental Science*, 10, 964327. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fenvs.2022.964327>
- Xia, S., You, D., Tang, Z., & Yang, B. (2021). Analysis of the Spatial Effect of Fiscal Decentralization and Environmental Decentralization on Carbon Emissions under the Pressure of Officials' Promotion. *Energies*, 14(7), 1878. <https://doi.org/10.3390/en14071878>
- Xue, L., Mithas, S., & Ray, G. (2021). Commitment to IT Investment Plans: The Interplay of Real Earnings, Management, IT Decentralization, and Corporate Governance. *MIS Quarterly*, 45(1), 193–224. <https://doi.org/10.25300/MISQ/2021/14970>
- Yang, X., Yan, J., Tian, K., Yu, Z., Yu Li, R., & Xia, S. (2021). Centralization or decentralization? The impact of different distributions of authority on China's environmental regulation. *Technological Forecasting and Social Change*, 173, 121172. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.techfore.2021.121172>
-

Copyright Holder :

© Livia Alves et al. (2024).

First Publication Right :

© Journal of Selvicoltura Asean

This article is under:

