



Analysis of the Presidential Government Model in Indonesia: Advantages, Disadvantages, and Suitable Alternatives

Rani Susanti

Al Ghifari University, Bandung, Indonesia
susantirani43@gmail.com

Received: 3 April 2025 | Accepted: 11 April 2025 | Published: 30 June 2025

Abstract

This study examines the presidential model of government implemented in Indonesia, focusing on its advantages and disadvantages in the context of politics and administration. The Indonesian presidential model, in which the president serves as both head of state and head of government, has advantages such as executive stability, clear separation of powers, and strong leadership. However, this model also faces challenges such as the risk of inter-institutional conflict, concentration of power in the president, and lack of parliamentary accountability. To address these shortcomings, this study evaluates several alternative models of government: the British parliamentary model, the Soviet model, and the traditional model. The British parliamentary model offers advantages such as flexibility in the formation and dissolution of government, as well as direct accountability to parliament, although it has the potential for political instability. The Soviet model, with its centralization of power, can increase decision-making efficiency but risks authoritarianism. The traditional model emphasizes local cultural values and is accepted at the community level, but faces challenges in adapting to the modern context. The results of this study indicate that the British parliamentary model is the most suitable alternative to address the shortcomings of Indonesia's presidential system. This model offers a balance between stability and accountability, and allows for better adaptation to the political and social dynamics in Indonesia. The implementation of the parliamentary model can improve government accountability and flexibility, thereby improving effectiveness and responsiveness to the needs of the community. Thus, the adoption of the parliamentary model can be a strategic step to improve governance in Indonesia.

Keywords: Government, Presidential, Parliamentary, Accountability, Alternative.

1. INTRODUCTION

The model of government is the fundamental structure that determines how a country is managed and how political power is distributed and exercised (Asyhabie, et al., 2025). In Indonesia, the model of government adopted is presidential, in which the president acts as head of state and head of government. This system has been in place since Indonesia's declaration of independence in 1945 and has undergone several significant changes, particularly after the 1998 reforms that marked the transition to a more open democracy (Salsabil, 2019). This introduction will discuss the background, history of implementation, and advantages and disadvantages of the presidential system of government in Indonesia. In addition, several alternative models of government that could be implemented to address the shortcomings of the current system will also be analyzed (Zulfan, 2018). The presidential model of government, as implemented in Indonesia, has several distinctive features that differentiate it from other systems, such as the parliamentary system (Wijaya, 2021). In a presidential model, the president is directly elected by the people through general elections and has a mandate to run the government for a certain period without depending on parliamentary support (Candanni, 2019). This is different from the parliamentary model, where the executive (prime minister) is elected by parliament and can be removed by a vote of no confidence.

The history of the implementation of the presidential model of government in Indonesia cannot be separated from the political and social context of the country. At the beginning of its independence, Indonesia adopted the presidential model in an effort to create stability amid a still unstable political



situation and the lingering threat of colonialism (Arifin, 2024). However, the initial implementation of this model faced various challenges, including conflicts between the president and parliament, which led to the dissolution of the Constituent Assembly by President Sukarno and the implementation of Guided Democracy in 1959. After the fall of the Old Order and the emergence of the New Order under President Suharto, the presidential model was maintained, albeit with different characteristics. During the New Order era, the president's power was very strong and centralized, often disregarding democratic principles and accountability. The 1998 reforms brought significant changes, including amendments to the 1945 Constitution that strengthened democratic principles and the separation of powers. The president was once again elected directly by the people, and various state institutions were redesigned to ensure checks and balances (Andriana, 2014). One of the advantages of the presidential system of government in Indonesia is executive stability. A president elected for a fixed term cannot be easily removed by parliament, allowing for continuity in government and the implementation of long-term policies. In addition, the clear separation of powers between the executive and legislative branches helps prevent excessive concentration of power in one institution and encourages effective checks and balances. Strong leadership is also one of the advantages of this model, in which the president has broad authority to make strategic decisions without having to rely on direct approval from parliament (Riwanto, 2014).

However, the presidential model of government in Indonesia also faces various challenges and shortcomings. One of the main shortcomings is the risk of conflict between institutions, especially between the executive and legislative branches. In situations where the president and parliament come from different political parties or have conflicting political agendas, deadlock or political gridlock often occurs, hindering effective legislation and governance. The concentration of too much power in the hands of the president is also an issue that needs to be watched out for, as it can lead to authoritarianism and abuse of power. The lack of parliamentary accountability is also one of the problems in Indonesia's presidential system of government. In this system, parliament does not have the authority to remove the president through a vote of no confidence, thereby weakening control over the executive branch. In addition, the presidential system often faces challenges in terms of fair and inclusive political representation, especially in the context of a highly pluralistic country such as Indonesia. Faced with these shortcomings, it is important to evaluate the possibility of adopting an alternative model of government that may be more suited to the political and social dynamics in Indonesia. One model worth considering is the parliamentary model as implemented in the United Kingdom. The parliamentary model has advantages in terms of flexibility in forming and dissolving governments, as well as higher accountability because the executive is directly responsible to parliament. In this model, the government can be brought down by parliament through a vote of no confidence, thereby encouraging stricter control over the performance of the executive.

In addition to the parliamentary model, the Soviet model of government can also be considered, albeit with some important caveats. The Soviet model, with its centralization of power and unity of command, can increase efficiency in decision-making. However, this model also carries a high risk of authoritarianism and restrictions on individual freedoms, which are certainly not in line with the democratic principles that Indonesia seeks to uphold. Therefore, the adoption of this model requires significant modifications to be applicable in the Indonesian context. Traditional models of government based on local cultural values and customs are also an interesting alternative to explore. In various regions of Indonesia, traditional systems of government are still practiced and accepted by local communities. This model emphasizes the importance of consensus and togetherness in decision-making, as well as respect for local values. However, the main challenge in this model is how to integrate it with an effective and efficient modern governance system, and how to ensure that traditional values do not hinder the process of democratization and national development (Adinda, et al., 2023).

In order to find the most suitable governance model for Indonesia, it is important to consider the unique historical, social, and cultural context of the country. Each governance model has its own advantages and disadvantages, and no single model is perfect or suitable for all countries. Therefore,



a thorough and comprehensive study is needed to evaluate various alternative governance models, as well as how these models can be adapted and applied in the Indonesian context. Thus, the presidential model of government in Indonesia has significant advantages and disadvantages. Executive stability, separation of powers, and strong leadership are advantages that can support effective governance. However, the risk of conflict between institutions, excessive concentration of power, and lack of parliamentary accountability are challenges that need to be addressed. Given the political and social dynamics in Indonesia, the British parliamentary model offers an attractive alternative with greater flexibility and accountability. However, the adoption of this model must also consider the local context and the needs of the Indonesian people. Therefore, further research and in-depth discussions are needed to find the most suitable governance model for Indonesia, one that can support political stability, effective governance, and better accountability.

2. METHOD

This study uses a descriptive qualitative method conducted through a literature review to explore (Creswell, 2019) and analyze the presidential system of government in Indonesia, including its advantages, disadvantages, and alternative models of government that may be more suitable. A qualitative approach was chosen because it allows researchers to understand the phenomenon of government in depth through an analysis of historical, social, and political contexts. The literature review as the main data source includes books, scientific journals, articles, official documents, and other relevant literature sources related to the research topic.

The data collection process was carried out by searching for literature discussing the presidential system of government, its implementation experience in Indonesia, and comparisons with other models of government such as the British parliamentary model, the Soviet model, and the traditional model. The collected data is then analyzed descriptively to identify relevant patterns, themes, and insights. This analysis involves a critical examination of existing theories, governance practices, and concrete cases that provide an overview of the strengths and weaknesses of each governance model. By using literature studies, this research does not rely on a single data source but integrates various perspectives and findings from existing literature. This allows researchers to build comprehensive and evidence-based arguments about the effectiveness of the presidential system of government in Indonesia and the possibility of implementing alternative models of government. The validity of the research is enhanced by selecting credible and relevant sources, as well as triangulating data by comparing findings from various literature. The results of the analysis are then presented in the form of detailed and comprehensive descriptions, providing clear and in-depth insights into the topic being studied.

3. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The Indonesian government currently uses a presidential system, in which the president serves as both head of state and head of government. This system was chosen in the hope that it would provide political stability and effective governance amid the country's vast ethnic, cultural, and geographical diversity. In a presidential system, the president is directly elected by the people through general elections and has a fixed term of office, usually five years, which can be extended once if re-elected. The president has broad executive powers, including the appointment and dismissal of cabinet ministers, and is responsible for the implementation of national laws and policies.

One of the main advantages of the presidential model of government is executive stability. Because the president has a fixed term, the government can run smoothly without the threat of the cabinet being dissolved by parliament, as often happens in parliamentary systems. This stability is important for planning and implementing long-term policies that can promote national



development. In addition, a president who is directly elected by the people has strong political legitimacy, enabling them to make strategic decisions with a clear mandate from the voters (Alfin & Priskap, 2021). The clear separation of powers between the executive, legislative, and judicial branches is also an advantage of the presidential system. This prevents the concentration of power in a single institution and ensures effective checks and balances. For example, although the president has broad executive powers, laws must be approved by parliament, and executive actions can be monitored by the judiciary. Thus, each branch of government has a role in overseeing and limiting the power of the other branches, thereby reducing the risk of abuse of power. Strong leadership is another advantageous aspect of the presidential system (Dairani & Fadlail, 2025). In times of crisis or when quick decisions are needed, the president has the authority to act without having to wait for approval from parliament. This allows for a faster and more effective response to urgent issues. Additionally, because the president does not depend on majority support in parliament to remain in power, they can make decisions that may not be popular in parliament but are necessary for the long-term interests of the country.

However, the presidential system in Indonesia also faces significant shortcomings. One of the main challenges is the risk of deadlock or political gridlock between the executive and legislative branches. In situations where the president and parliament are controlled by different political parties or have conflicting agendas, conflict between institutions is often unavoidable. This deadlock can hinder effective legislation and governance, as important laws and strategic policies may be delayed or even unable to be implemented. The concentration of power in the president is also an issue that needs to be watched. Although the separation of powers is designed to prevent abuse of power, in practice, a president with strong political support can ignore or weaken the control of other institutions. This can lead to authoritarianism and corruption, which are contrary to the principles of democracy and good governance. In addition, in a presidential system, the president often has broad authority to issue decrees and regulations without parliamentary approval, which can cause dissatisfaction and injustice among the people (Isnaini, 2020).

The lack of parliamentary accountability is also a problem in presidential systems. Parliament does not have the authority to remove the president through a vote of no confidence, which means that control over the executive branch is weaker. As a result, presidents can govern without fear of political consequences for their actions, as long as they do not blatantly violate the law. This can lead to a lack of transparency and accountability in executive decision-making. Faced with these shortcomings, it is important to consider alternative models of government that may be more suited to Indonesia's social, political, and cultural context. One model worth considering is the parliamentary model as implemented in the United Kingdom. The parliamentary model offers several advantages that can help overcome the shortcomings of the presidential system. First, flexibility in the formation and dissolution of government. In a parliamentary system, the government can be dissolved through a vote of no confidence by parliament, allowing for the formation of a new government that is more effective and responsive to changing political dynamics. This flexibility can reduce the risk of political deadlock and ensure that the government always has the support of a parliamentary majority.

Greater accountability is also one of the advantages of the parliamentary model. Because the executive is directly accountable to parliament, there is stricter control over government actions. Parliament has the authority to oversee and evaluate the performance of the executive, and can take action if the government fails to perform its duties properly. This promotes transparency and accountability in government decision-making. However, the parliamentary model also has several drawbacks that need to be considered. One of them is the potential for political instability. In a parliamentary system, the government can be dissolved at any time if it loses the support of the parliamentary majority, which can lead to frequent changes in government. This instability can hinder the implementation of long-term policies and create political uncertainty. In addition, the dominance of the majority party in parliament can lead to a lack of representation from minority parties, which can cause dissatisfaction among the public (Yanuarti & Nurhasim, 2013).



Another alternative that can be considered is the Soviet model of government. This model emphasizes centralization of power and unity of command, which can increase efficiency in decision-making. In the Soviet model, power is centralized in one institution or individual, allowing decisions to be made quickly and implemented effectively. However, this model carries a high risk of authoritarianism and restrictions on individual freedoms. Furthermore, the Soviet model is not in line with the democratic principles that Indonesia seeks to uphold, so its implementation would require significant modification to be applicable in the Indonesian context. Traditional governance models based on local cultural values and customs are also an interesting alternative to explore. In various regions of Indonesia, traditional governance systems are still practiced and accepted by local communities. This model emphasizes the importance of consensus and unity in decision-making, as well as respect for local values. Traditional governance systems are often closer to the community and better understand their needs and aspirations. However, the main challenge in this model is how to integrate it with an effective and efficient modern governance system. Traditional systems tend to be slower in decision-making and may be less responsive to rapid changes in the era of globalization. In addition, traditional values must be adapted to the principles of democracy and human rights to ensure that no discrimination or injustice occurs (Saraswati, 2012).

In the context of finding the most suitable model of government for Indonesia, it is important to consider a combination of various elements in these models. For example, adopting the flexibility and accountability of the parliamentary model, while maintaining the executive stability that is the strength of the presidential system. In addition, strengthening checks and balances and transparency in government can help address the shortcomings of the current presidential model. Integrating traditional values into the modern government system can also help create a more responsive government that is appropriate to the local context.

The presidential model of government is a system of government in which executive power is clearly separated from the legislative and judicial branches (Rohmah, 2019). Indonesia is one of the countries that adopts a presidential system of government. In analyzing the presidential model of government in Indonesia, we need to look at both its advantages and disadvantages, as well as possible alternatives to overcome existing problems. One of the advantages of the presidential system of government is the clear division of power between the executive and legislative branches. In this system, the president has broad executive authority to run the government without interference from parliament. This allows for quick and efficient decision-making in emergency or crisis situations that require swift action. In addition, this system also allows for clear accountability, as the president is directly elected by the people and is responsible to them.

However, the presidential system of government has a number of disadvantages that need to be considered. One of them is the possibility of confrontation between the legislative and executive branches. The government and parliament often clash due to the rigid separation of powers, which can hinder national progress and decision-making. Furthermore, the president usually has considerable power in a presidential system, which increases the likelihood of authoritarianism or abuse of power. To overcome these weaknesses, there are several alternatives that can be considered. One of them is a semi-presidential system of government, in which executive power is shared between the president and the prime minister. In this system, the president is responsible for foreign policy and defense, while the prime minister is responsible for domestic affairs and the economy. Thus, the division of power becomes more balanced and can reduce the potential for conflict between the executive and legislative branches.

In addition, other theories of administrative law can also provide valuable insights into improving the presidential model of government. For example, the concept of "checks and balances" found in the US government system can be applied to strengthen oversight mechanisms over presidential power. With independent institutions such as the Constitutional Court and the Election Supervisory Agency, the potential for abuse of power by the president can be prevented or minimized (Rifqi, 2024). In addition, the principles of deliberative democracy can also serve as a guide in increasing public participation in the decision-making process. By involving the public more actively in



discussions and policy formulation, we can ensure that the decisions made by the government truly reflect the interests and will of the people.

Furthermore, good governance principles such as transparency, accountability, and participation can also help reduce the potential for failure in the presidential model of government. By implementing good practices in government management, we can improve the efficiency, integrity, and legitimacy of the government. In developing suitable alternatives to address the weaknesses of the presidential model of government, it is necessary to conduct an in-depth evaluation of the political, cultural, and historical context of each country. There is no one solution that can be applied universally, but by learning from the experiences of other countries and applying the principles of democracy, good governance, and the rule of law, we can build a model of government that is more effective and responsive to the needs of society.

CONCLUSION

The presidential system of government in Indonesia has advantages, including strong leadership, executive stability, and genuine independence of power. However, this system also has weaknesses, such as the possibility of political deadlock and excessive power, as well as a lack of parliamentary accountability. The British parliamentary model offers an attractive alternative with greater flexibility and accountability, although it has the potential for political instability. The Soviet model, with its centralization of power, is not in line with the democratic principles that Indonesia wishes to uphold, while the traditional model emphasizes local values that can strengthen the relationship between the government and the people. Therefore, the most effective solution may be to adopt the best elements of these various models of government to create a system that is more suited to Indonesia's needs and context. Further research and in-depth discussion are needed to evaluate how these elements can be integrated and applied in Indonesia's system of government to support political stability, effective governance, and better accountability.

REFERENCES

- Adinda, R. A., Fatmala, C., & Hijri, Y. S. (2023). Perbandingan Sistem Pemerintahan Presidensial di Indonesia dan Amerika Serikat. *Jurnal Pendidikan dan Konseling (JPDK)*, 5(1), 2347-2353.
- Alfin, M. A. A., & Priskap, R. (2021). Analisis Yuridis Tentang Sistem Pemerintahan Presidensial Berdasarkan Undang-Undang Dasar Negara Republik Indonesia TAHUN 1945. *Limbago: Journal of Constitutional Law*, 1(1), 77-95.
- Andriana, N. (2014). Pemilu dan relasi eksekutif dan legislatif. *Journal of Political Research*, 11(2), 28-28.
- Arifin, F. (2024). Pembentukan Kabinet dalam Sistem Pemerintahan Presidensial di Indonesia: Studi Komparasi UUD 1945 Sebelum Dan Setelah Perubahan. *Lex Renaissance*, 9(2), 333-358.
- Asyhabie, A., Reinohaadi, R., Maulana, H. S., Jumiati, J., & Saputra, B. (2025). Kompleksitas Kelembagaan Negara Indonesia: Tinjauan Literatur Terhadap Struktur, Fungsi, Dan Koordinasi Organisasi Pemerintahan. *Jurnal Kajian Hukum Dan Kebijakan Publik* | E-ISSN: 3031-8882, 2(2), 1309-1313.
- Candanni, L. R. (2019). Ketentuan Ambang Batas Pencalonan Presiden Dalam Pemilihan Umum Presiden dan Wakil Presiden Dalam Perspektif Sistem Pemerintahan Presidensial (The Presidential Threshold Requiremen.



- Dairani, D., & Fadlail, A. (2025). Isnaini, I. (2020). Koalisi Partai Politik Dalam Sistem Pemerintahan Presidensial Indonesia. *CIVICUS: Pendidikan-Penelitian-Pengabdian Pendidikan Pancasila dan Kewarganegaraan*, 8(1), 93-104.
- John W. Creswell. (2019). *Research Design (Pendekatan Metode Kualitatif, Kuantitatif dan Campuran)* (Pustaka Pelajar (ed.); IV). Pustaka Pelajar.
- Rifqi, M. Penyalahgunaan Kekuasaan Lembaga-Lembaga Penguasa Pada Pemilu Di Indonesia Tahun 2024 Perspektif Imam Al-Ghazali (505H/1111M) (Bachelor's thesis, Fakultas Syariah dan Hukum UIN Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta).
- Riwanto, A. (2014). Inkompatibilitas Asas Pengaturan Sistem Pemilu dengan Sistem Pemerintahan Presidensial di Indonesia. *Jurnal Hukum Ius Quia Iustum*, 21(4), 509-530.
- Rohmah, E. I. (2019). Perbandingan Sistem Pemerintahan Indonesia, Iran, dan Perancis. *Ummul Qura Jurnal Institut Pesantren Sunan Drajat (INSUD) Lamongan*, 13(1), 117-134.
- Salsabil, M. N. E. (2019). Sistem Presidensial Dan Dinamika Hubungan Eksekutif-Legislatif Studi Perbandingan Sistem Pemerintahan Di Indonesia Di Era Reformasi Dan Turki Pasca Referendum 2017 (Bachelor's thesis, FISIP UIN Jakarta).
- Saraswati, R. (2012). Desain sistem pemerintahan presidensial yang efektif. *Masalah-Masalah Hukum*, 41(1), 137-143.
- Wijaya, D. (2021). Pengaruh Pemilu Serentak Terhadap Penguatan Sistem Presidensial Di Indonesia. *Independen: Jurnal Politik Indonesia dan Global*, 2(2), 17-28.
- Yanuarti, S., & Nurhasim, M. (2013). Mencari Sistem Pemilu dan Kepartaian yang Memperkuat Sistem Presidensial. *Journal of Political Research*, 10(2), 17-17.
- Zulfan, Z. (2018). Analisis Pengaturan dan Praktik Pemisahan Kekuasaan Sistem Pemerintahan Presidensial Berdasarkan Konstitusi. *Jurnal Media Hukum*, 25(1), 60-67.