



The description of community participation in development

Yakobus Fahik¹, Adeodata Laniria Charla Barros Mbiri², Remigius Seran³

¹Public Administration Study Program, Timor University, Indonesia

^{2,3}Governmental Science Study Program, Timor University, Indonesia

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received May 31, 2024

Revised Jun 2, 2024

Accepted Jun 13, 2024

Keywords:

Community Participation
Development
Participation Ladder

ABSTRACT

The research focuses on community participation in the implementation of the work program in Teba Village: whether the work program implemented is the result of a decision-making process or the village head's initiative. Using Arnstein's participation ladder, we will describe the level of community participation in development in Teba Village, Biboki Tan Pah District, Timor Tengah Utara Regency. The data was collected using the interview method and supported by documents like village meeting minutes, meeting attendance lists, and work plan documents from 2019-2024. The data analyzed is to determine the level of community participation. We found that community participation in Teba village was at the second level. At the information provision rung, the public is getting information, but a decision already took. In the consultation rung, the village head holds discussion forums but does not have a guarantee the village government accept the suggestion. In placation rung, the government makes promises but is easy to ignore..

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) license.



Corresponding Author:

Yakobus Fahik,
Public Administration Science Study Program,
Timor University,
Jln El-Tari, KM.9 Kota Kefamenanu, kode pos 85631, Indonesia
Email: yakobusfahik@unimor.ac.id

1. INTRODUCTION

Village Law No. 6 of 2014 is a law that gives broad space for villages to take care of themselves. It means the villages have the authority to regulate themselves at the village level. The authority provides space for villages to develop according to the needs and conditions of the villages. Because of the authority given by its Laws, the spirit of development according to this Law is participatory development.

To create participatory development, Village Law No. 6 of 2014 established a village decision-making process/ Musdes (Pemerintah Republik Indonesia, 2014). The village decision-making process in this law is a most strategic village forum to discuss Village structuring, Village planning, Village cooperation, investment plans entering the Village, the formation of Village BUMs, additions and disposals of Village assets, and extraordinary events. It means that all village activities are decided at the deliberation forum. Therefore, Musdes is the highest arena and forum for significant and strategic process decision-making and responding to challenges and problems in a dialogue and participatory manner in the villages (Rozaki & Yulianto, 2015).

However, villages today still tend to inherit the top-down approach and practice patron-client social relations. It is the old paradigm of village development (Hartono, 2023). Corruption of village funds by village heads is an indicator of less participatory development practices. Nahak et al., (2019), in a case study in Naran Village, Raimanuk District, Belu Regency, stated that culture is a factor that causes people to be reluctant to participate. A reluctant showing in the *manfatin ukunrai* culture. The *manfatin ukunrai* culture is the culture of the royal government. The *manfatin*

ukunrai culture is dominant in the community's mindset and makes the perspective on participation limited to implementing government programs and not to planners (Nahak, 2019). It's an inheritance of the old culture of development. The culture is against the spirit of Village Law No. 6 of 2014. This law demands community participation from planning to evaluating.

Participatory development has a positive impact on village progress. Research conducted by Dokubo, C Elemuwa, & Chile, Cyril shows that community involvement in project development in Ikwerre and Emohua has had a positive and significant impact (Dokubo et al., 2021). Alim et al (2021) stated that every tourism development requires the support of the local community to achieve long-term success. Village communities where tourism is developed must be involved in the decision-making process and tourism operations (Alim et al., 2021).

According to Rudi Hartono, there are four impacts of participatory development. The first is participatory development based on residents' needs. Second, participatory development gives birth to inclusive developers. Third, participatory development encourages transparency in the use of village funds. Fourth, participatory development empowers village residents, advances political awareness, and strengthens social cohesion (Hartono, 2023). Rostam claims that there are four reasons why community participation matters: 1) The community that participates benefits; 2) It reflects the fundamental needs and values of the common good; 3) It ensures that needs will be met by the community sustainably; and 4) It seeks to generate the best decisions when it comes to implementing development (Rostam N. G., 2018). Likewise, research conducted by Cortés-Cediel, María E. Cantador, Iván Bolívar, and Manuel Pedro Rodríguez shows that citizen participation is one of the main instruments to make the government open and close to the needs of citizens. Their research on Analyzing Citizen Participation and Engagement in European Smart Cities stated that creative Smart Cities can only be achieved by countries that manage their projects in a participatory manner (Cortés-Cediel et al., 2021).

Community participation can also positively impact economic growth (Aji Fany Permana & Endah Oktafiana Dewi, 2023; Kim et al., 2021; Mulyan & Martoni, 2024; Purnomo & Dewi, 2022; Rahmanu et al., 2023). In research conducted by Aji Fany Permana and Endah Oktafiana Dewi regarding community participation in the development of tourist villages, there are financial impacts, namely in the form of economic benefits through transactions that occur, the emergence of new business ideas around the tourist village area, increased development of village infrastructure, and job creation, both in the trade and services sectors (Aji Fany Permana & Endah Oktafiana Dewi, 2023).

Community participation is a principle of the current democratic system. So, community participation in development is an essential manifestation of democracy itself. Ank Michelsa and Laurens De Graaf (2017) stated that public participation in policymaking has a positive impact on democracy, namely contributing to an inclusive policy process, encouraging civic skills and virtues, leading to rational decision-making based on public reasoning (deliberation), and increasing the legitimacy of the process and results (legitimacy) (Michels & De Graaf, 2017).

Meanwhile, according to Kusumawardani in Purwaningsih (2008), community participation in development is vital for three main reasons. The first is participation as a tool to obtain information from local communities about conditions, attitudes, and needs. Second, community participation will increase trust and ownership in development projects or programs. Third, participation is a means to fulfill community rights (Purwaningsih, 2008).

Seeing the importance of participatory development above, discussions about it must continue in public spaces. We are using the perspective of Sherry R. Arnstein (Arnstein, 1969) to describe community participation. She has introduced the participation ladder. Citizen participation starts from the first level, namely the manipulation ladder and the therapy ladder. The rungs of manipulation and therapy have the aim of "educating" and "treating" society. So, at the first level, there is no participation or non-participation. At the second, there is informing, consulting, and placating rung. In the informing rung, the public gets information, however the decision is taken beforehand. The public does not have the opportunity to ask questions. In the consultation rung, the discussion was organized. The decision-makers hear and accommodate the proposals/suggestions but do not have a guarantee to be accepted. At the placation rung, there have been discussions and suggestions accepted but they are just promises that are easy to

ignore. Sherry R. Arnstein named second-level is tokenism. In the third level, there are partnership rung, delegation of power, and control by society. At the partnership ladder, the community has the influence and the ability to bargain with decision-makers. At the level of delegation of power, the community has full authority to manage a policy object. And at the rung of control by society, government power is in the hands of the public. At this third level, Arnstein calls citizen power (Arnstein, 1969).

Seeing the impact of community participation in development as we described above, this research aims to broaden understanding of the practice of community participation in development as an effort to implement the Village Law. Therefore, in describing the level of community participation using Arnstein's participation ladder, we chose Teba Village as the research location and object of the case study in this research. The selection of Teba village was due to the following subjective assessment: First, this village is led by a millennial village head. Second, this village is a village that did not take part in the simultaneous village head election on 17 May 2023 in North Central Timor Regency. Third, access to this village is easier for us because it is crossed by a national road. And this research is independent research so we chose a location that was easy for us to reach. Fourth, the choice of Teba village was also due to the strategic location of this village. This village is village borders directly with Belu Regency and Malaka Regency. And for us, there will be more benefits to conducting comparative studies between villages in the future. This is subjective thinking makes us choose Teba village as our research locus.

This research focuses on community participation, which will be operating at the work program carried out by the Teba village: whether the work program implementation is the effect of process decision-making in the village forum or the village head's initiative. The work program implemented is our main focus to determine community involvement from planning to evaluation. Citizen participation in the work program will provide a complete picture of the community participation level and help us to analyze using Arnstein ladder participation. From the focus of the research above, this research aims to find out the practice of community participation in development in Teba Village and, at the same time, find out what level of community participation is in Teba Village.

2. RESEARCH METHOD

This research method is qualitative research, and the focus is community participation. To conduct this research, we will focus on the Teba village head's work program to describe the participation level. We will conduct in-depth interviews with the village head, four hamlet leaders, one community leader, one traditional leader, one religious leader, and five residents. The total number of respondents is thirteen people. We chose these respondents because, in our opinion, they are representatives of the community and have in-depth information about the work programs implemented in the village. Selecting respondents in this way can produce more meaningful data that we can use to describe the level of participation in development. Respondents will be interviewed in depth about community participation in work programs run by the village head, using a semi-structured interview style. It means that several questions have been prepared and asked according to the answers given by the respondent. We also collect meeting minutes, attendance lists, village government work plans (RKPdes), and village medium-term development plans (RPJMDes). After the data is collected, the data will analyzed using Arnstein's participation ladder.

3. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Frequency of Village Deliberations (Musdes) in Teba Village

Village deliberation can be held at least once a year. It can be seen at Article 54, paragraph 3 of Village Law No. 6 of 2014 (Pemerintah Republik Indonesia, 2014). It means every year needs to be a village meeting. Data collected through interviews with village heads stated the village deliberation had been held four times with several variations. The first was made in 2020, the second in 2021, the third in 2022, and the fourth in 2023. The first and second village deliberation is done after the Hamlet meeting (musdus). In the third village deliberation, there is a variation. The village meeting is carried out without a prior village meeting but based on data from the previous year. In 2023, village meetings were not based on Hamlet meeting data but

on information available on the village ministry's SDG website. Why like this? The Village Head argued the SDG's application data was complete and credible. Apart from that, in planning development in villages, villages must also adapt to regulations from the Minister of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Areas, and Transmigration regarding priority use of village funds issued annually. Besides, the village must also synchronize the financing nomenclature in the village financial system (*siskeudes*) in determining the work program. The description above shows that Teba Village is implementing the orders contained in the Village Law regarding village meetings with variations made by the village head himself.

Representation of participants at the village deliberation

The village law is a law that adheres to the idea of representation in village meetings. The village meeting is participated by the village council, village government, and elements of the village community (Article 54 paragraph 1 Law No. 6 of 2014). Rozaki, A and Sg Yulianto explained that the elements of village society in question are traditional leaders, religious leaders, community leaders, educational leaders, representatives of farmer groups, representatives of fishermen groups, representatives of crafting groups, representatives of women's groups, representatives of observer groups, and child protection, and representatives of poor community groups. Attended the elements of society's priorities are those that match with the village deliberation material. A necessary thing under Village Law No. 6 of 2014 is the presence of vulnerable groups in village meetings. The means of vulnerable groups are poor women, disabled people, the old, and children (Rozaki & Yulianto, 2015).

The findings based on the attendance list at the village meeting in Teba village show that the participants who attend the village deliberation every year are the same people: the village deliberative body, the village government, and traditional leaders or elders in the village. Vulnerable groups are not on the list of village meeting participants. What does the list of participants in this village meeting want to say? The attendance list for the village meeting participants states that understanding representation in practice creates exclusivity for certain parties and perpetuates false beliefs in society. The village council, village government, and community elements are exclusive groups that are continuously invited to represent the community in village meetings and are trusted to speak for the interests of many people. Understanding representation continues to strengthen the practice of elite capture (Rozaki & Yulianto, 2015). Research conducted by Imelda Nahak and friends in Naran village in 2019 found why only hamlet heads, RT/RW, and community leaders can participate in village deliberations. Because they are people trusted by the government and society as the party that best knows the needs of the citizens, they must speak based on the community's interests (Nahak et al., 2019). Besides that, if not properly controlled, the understanding of representation will perpetuate what Walter Lippman said is the disease of democracy: democratic practices prioritize feelings of likes and dislikes (Lippman, 1955). In another way, Ermalindus Albinus Sonbay says that there will be polarization in society, which will both experience pain, whether it's the winning or the losing group. Those who win are sick because they will continue to shout about the badness and shortcomings of the losers, and losers are sick because, during one period of leadership, they will shown as a group that is hurt. These two types of pain are seen as a misreading of democracy (Sonbay, 2023). It is showing in Teba village. During the village meeting, those invited have the same interests as the village head or vice versa. So, the polarization as a misreading of democracy is real and alive today.

However, many factors cause someone not to be able to participate in the village meeting, namely level of education (Rumeste RS, 2012), level of busyness (Wijaksono, 2013), and cultural factors (Nahak, 2019). The other factors are a lack of community awareness of the importance of involvement in any village development and a lack of space given by the village government to communities who will participate (Irawan & Sunandar, 2020). Shunglu et al (2022) argue that a lack of awareness of the profound socio-political differences across communities and assumptions of homogeneity cause attempts to apply participatory methodologies to frequently fall short of engaging all factions within a community (Shunglu et al., 2022). In Teba village, the factor that prevents someone from participating in the village meeting is the lack of notification. One of the people during the interview stated he couldn't join the village meetings because he was not getting an invitation. Meanwhile, those who participated were those who received invitations.

In the case of Teba Village, the thing that must be made is to foster a spirit of inclusive participation in village meetings. It's to accommodate all interested parties with village deliberation material and not to continue to perpetuate elite capture. One indicator of the success of village deliberations is the involvement of many elements of society in village deliberations. The more and larger the community is involved in the village meeting, the stronger the legitimacy of the results meeting will be in front of the community (Rozaki & Yulianto, 2015). Rozaki and Yulianto added that people accustomed to participating in village meetings will increase the sense of mutual trust among village communities and that trust is valuable capital in development and empowerment in the village (Rozaki & Yulianto, 2015).

Teba village work program

The village head's work program must be in sync with the instructions in the Minister of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration regulations regarding the priority use of village funds issued every year. For 2020 to 2022, village funds priority to prevent COVID-19 as a non-natural disaster, reduce poverty, and prevent stunting. It can be seen in the Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration (PDRT) Village Regulation No. 14 of 2020 (Kementerian Desa, 2020), PDRT Village Regulation No. 7 of 2021 (Kementerian Desa, 2021), and PDRT Village Regulation No. 8 of 2022 (Kementerian Desa, 2022). For this reason, Teba village, in translating the village minister's regulations regarding priority use of village funds with the following program:

First, clean water. The clean water program is one of the work programs to realize the mission of the elected village head. It is inseparable from the lack of availability of clean water for the community. People have to get water from wells or have to buy clean water from other districts, namely Belu Regency because this village is a village that geographically borders Belu Regency and Malaka Regency. As long as there is no clean water available, the people of this village buy water from Belu Regency at a price per one 6000 liter water tank of IDR 135,000. To these conditions, the clean water program is urgent. During the hamlet deliberation, the community in the four hamlets in this village proposed that in 2020, providing clean water should be a priority program. The proposal is accepted. And in 2020, the program was held. Now, people are enjoying clean water.

Second, stimulant house program. Stimulant housing is a housing assistance program given to eighteen heads of families (KK). The amount of assistance is ten million rupiah per head of family in the form of building materials. The stimulant housing program is an assistance program with a financing scheme partly borne by the beneficiary and partly covered by the village government.

The conditions for recipients of stimulant housing assistance are families who are vulnerable to poverty and not yet touched by assistance from village funds such as direct cash assistance (BLT). Meanwhile, for underprivileged families who receive stimulant housing, the village takes data based on data about underprivileged families available in the SDG's application. Based on this data, the village head determines who can receive stimulant housing assistance.

In determining who is eligible to gain the stimulant housing program, the village head decides for himself. The information is closed. One of the residents, in an interview, said, "We did hear that there would be stimulant housing assistance, but we did not know who should receive it. The village head himself determines who can receive it" (Interview, 18 September 2023).

Third, the street light program. The street light program is a program to provide village electricity to support village SDG No. 7, namely villages with clean and renewable energy. The village head conducts the program by installing 12 street lights without community involvement. The village head only ordered his 'trusted people' to work on the program. The program had execution. And the program leads not to energy independence but to energy dependence. Dependency energy, because the lights connect to the kWh of residents' homes. Whether the village is bright or not depends on the kindness of the owner of the kWh. Currently, at the same points, the street lights do not turn on at night. One of the residents we interviewed stated that the street lights did not turn on because they waste electricity. From the SDG's perspective, village governments should install solar-based lights to encourage energy independence.

Fourth, security food and animal programs. The program is already implemented and conducted based on the instructions of the village ministry as stated in the PDTT village regulation No. 13 of 2023. The ministry has determined that twenty percent (20%) of village funds to implement the food and animal security programs.

In translating this program, Teba village allocated funds to procure 34 cows to distribute to 34 heads of families. The conditions for receiving cattle assistance are that families are vulnerable to poverty, are not yet getting village financial assistance, and are willing to accept this assistance. Determining the requirements is conveyed at the village meeting, but who receives it is only decided by the village head himself.

Stage of community participation in development

Participation is a vital element in development because community participation can improve the welfare of farmers and strengthen local institutions. That happens with participation in Sukorejo village, Rejoso District (Purwaningsih, 2008, p.451). Therefore, community participation by Village Law No. 6 of 2014 starts from planning to the evaluation stages. It means that all stages of development must involve the community.

From the description of the village deliberation and Teba village work program, the description of the level of community participation using Arnstein's participation ladder in this village is at the second level. According to Arnstein, at this second level, there are steps of providing information, consultation, and taking heart.

On the informing rung, according to Arnstein, information tends to be one-way, and there is no space for negotiation from the community. From our analysis of the village meetings and work programs implementation, this happens in Teba village; information is one way, and people cannot negotiate. Information is only known by the village head. In the stimulant house assistance program and the cattle assistance program, what happens is that the village head himself knows who can and deserves to receive the assistance. During village meetings, the village head only conveys the program that will be working on and the requirements for acceptance. Determining who will be receiving this assistance is determined by the village head himself.

Apart from that, according to Arnstein, meetings can be designed to become a one-way communication tool by providing superficial information, discouraging questions, and irrelevant answers. What happened in Teba Village was that one-way communication occurred during village meetings. The village meeting is a chance for the village head to read the work program for one year. Village deliberations are used as a forum to gain legitimacy from the citizens and not a forum to discuss the needs of the village community. During the interview, the village head admitted that village deliberations were a forum to gain legitimacy to disburse village funds for implementing work programs.

At the consultation rung, the method used is to create a public forum or discussion. The total of people present becomes a tool to measure participation. The attendees' list of village deliberations in Teba village showed less participation because the same people still attended the deliberations every year. Arnstein says the same participants present in deliberation is just a ritual. In Teba village, the public discussion is just a formality. The decision was already taken previously alone by the village head. The clean water program is just the only program implemented through deliberation. Furthermore, for other programs, the determining eligibility recipients are determined alone by the village head.

On the placation rung, there is an attempt to provide 'consolation' to the community with promises. Those who did not attend the deliberation be promised to invite them to the next meeting. It's only a false promise. At the upcoming village meeting, they aren't invited. The other placation is when the village head asks the community in the deliberation to submit the suggestion, but the suggestion is not accommodated. The village head is just 'consoled' the community. The other reason for the head village to reject suggestions is that not match with instructions from the Ministry of Villages regarding government priority programs or do not comply with the financing nomenclature from the Ministry of Finance. And this is a good alibi from the head village.

4. CONCLUSION

From the description above regarding community participation in development, we concluded that the description of community participation in development in Teba village using Arnstein's participation ladder is at the second level. At the informing rung, the public is getting information, but a decision already took. At the consultation rung, the village government conducts discussion forums. The result of the discussion does not have a guarantee to be accepted. In placation, the government makes promises but is easy to ignore.

This research expects to contribute to developing theories about community participation in development. By using Arnstein's perspective, we have carried out an in-depth analysis of the level of community participation in development, as well as the impact of this participation on local development.

In addition, this research can also contribute to practice because the research results can using as a guide for government and non-government organizations in designing effective community participation programs. Furthermore, research findings can provide a basis for creating alternative communication techniques and tactics to increase the number of participants in the development process. Therefore, this research not only enriches the academic literature but also directly impacts development efforts in the field.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We want to express our thanks to the head of the research and community service institute at Timor University, who has given us a license to conduct our independent research, and we also express our thanks to our respondents in Teba Village.

REFERENCES

- Aji Fany Permana, & Endah Oktafiana Dewi. (2023). Community Participation in Tourism Village Development and Its Impact on Local Community Economies. *Proceeding of International Conference on Islamic Economics, Islamic Banking, Zakah and Waqf*. <https://doi.org/10.24090/ieibzawa.v1i.785>
- Alim, A., Jee, T. W., Voon, M. L., Ngui, K. S., & Kasuma, J. (2021). TOURISM DEVELOPMENT through COMMUNITIES' SUPPORT: RURAL COMMUNITIES' PERSPECTIVE. *Geojournal of Tourism and Geosites*. <https://doi.org/10.30892/gtg.394spl18-791>
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A Ladder Of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Planning Association*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225>
- Cortés-Cediel, M. E., Cantador, I., & Bolívar, M. P. R. (2021). Analyzing Citizen Participation and Engagement in European Smart Cities. *Social Science Computer Review*. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894439319877478>
- Dokubo, C., Elemuwa, & Chile, C. (2021). Impact of Citizenship Participation on Community Development Projects in Ikwere and Emohua Local Government Area of Rivers State. *International Journal of Innovative Psychology & Social Development*.
- Hartono, R. (2023, July 12). Revisi UU Desa Belum Menjawab Kebutuhan Rakyat Desa. *Kompas.Com*. <https://nasional.kompas.com/read/2023/07/12/13122261/revisi-uu-desa-belum-menjawab-kebutuhan-rakyat-desa?page=all>
- Irawan, A., & Sunandar, E. (2020). Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pembangunan Kampung. *Madani Jurnal Politik Dan Sosial Kemasyarakatan*. <https://doi.org/10.52166/madani.v12i03.2170>
- Kementerian Desa. (2020). Peraturan Menteri Desa, Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal, Dan Transmigrasi Republik Indonesia Nomor 14 Tahun 2020 Tentang Perubahan Ketiga Atas Peraturan Menteri Desa, Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal, Dan Transmigrasi Nomor 11 Tahun 2019 Tentang Prioritas Peng. In *Menteri Desa* (Vol. 51, Issue 1, p. 51). Menteri Desa. [https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Download/143408/Permendesa Nomor 14 Tahun 2020.pdf](https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Download/143408/Permendesa%20Nomor%2014%20Tahun%2020.pdf)
- Kementerian Desa. (2021). *Peraturan Menteri Desa, Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal, Dan Transmigrasi Republik Indonesia Nomor 7 Tahun 2021 Tentang Prioritas Penggunaan Dana Desa Tahun 2022* (Vol. 961, Issue 7, pp. 1-16). Kementerian Hukum dan HAM. [https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Download/193605/Nomor 7 Tahun 2021.pdf](https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Download/193605/Nomor%207%20Tahun%2021.pdf)
- Kementerian Desa. (2022). Peraturan Menteri Desa, Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal, Dan Transmigrasi Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 Tahun 2022 Tentang Prioritas Penggunaan Dana Desa Tahun 2023. In *Kementerian Desa Republik Indonesia* (Vol. 960, pp. 1-10). Kementerian Hukum dan HAM. [https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Download/296169/Permendes PDTT Nomor 8 Tahun 2022.pdf](https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Download/296169/Permendes%20PDTT%20Nomor%208%20Tahun%2022.pdf)
- Kim, S., Kang, Y., Park, J., & Kang, S. E. (2021). The impact of residents' participation on their support for tourism development at a community level destination. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su13094789>

- Lippmann, W. (1955). The Public Philosophy. In *An Atlantic Monthly Press Book*. An Atlantic Monthly Press Book. <https://archive.org/details/essaysinpublicph00inlipp>
- Michels, A., & De Graaf, L. (2017). Examining citizen participation: local participatory policymaking and democracy revisited. *Local Government Studies*. <https://doi.org/10.1080/03003930.2017.1365712>
- Mulyan, A., & Martoni, A. (2024). Community Participation in Village Tourism Development. *International Journal of Multicultural and Multireligious Understanding*. <https://doi.org/10.18415/ijmmu.v11i3.5559>
- Nahak, I. (2019). "Ka'En Kelun Ba Malu" in Distribution of Culture and Level of Community Participation. *JSSH (Jurnal Sains Sosial Dan Humaniora)*, 3(2), 149. <https://doi.org/10.30595/jssh.v3i2.5056>
- Pemerintah Republik Indonesia. (2014). Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 tentang Desa. In *Ministry of Law and Human Rights* (Vol. 6, pp. 1–65). 2014. [https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Download/27840/UU Nomor 06 Tahun 2014.pdf](https://peraturan.bpk.go.id/Download/27840/UU%20Nomor%2006%20Tahun%202014.pdf)
- Purnomo, H., & Dewi, M. H. U. (2022). ANALISIS DAMPAK KEBIJAKAN PENGEMBANGAN PARIWISATA BUDAYA TERHADAP KESEJAHTERAAN MASYARAKAT ADAT OSING DI KABUPATEN BANYUWANGI. *E-Jurnal Ekonomi Dan Bisnis Universitas Udayana*. <https://doi.org/10.24843/eeb.2022.v11.i07.p02>
- Purwaningsih, E. (2008). Citizen Participation in Development. *Jantra*, III(6), 443–452. https://repositori.kemdikbud.go.id/5148/1/Jantra_Vol._III_No._6_Desember_2008.pdf#page=57
- Rahmanu, I., Kesehatan, I., & Masyarakat, K. (2023). Partisipasi masyarakat dan stakeholder dalam penyelenggaraan program Corporate Social Responsibility (CSR) dan dampaknya terhadap komunitas perdesaan. *Jurnal.Stikeskesdam4dip.Ac.Id*.
- Rostam N. G., A. M. & M. M. (2018). a Scientometric Review of Citizen. *Theoretical and Emperical Research in Urban Management*, 13(3), 37–54.
- Rozaki, A., & Yulianto, S. (2015). Pelembagaan Demokrasi melalui Musyawarah Desa. *Institute for Research and Empowerment*.
- Rumeste RS, I. (2012). Model Ideal Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pembentukan Peraturan Daerah. *Jurnal Dinamika Hukum*, 12(1), 135–148. <https://doi.org/10.20884/1.jdh.2012.12.1.111>
- Shunglu, R., Köpke, S., Kanoi, L., Nissanka, T. S., Withanachchi, C. R., Gamage, D. U., Dissanayake, H. R., Kibaroglu, A., Ünver, O., & Withanachchi, S. S. (2022). Barriers in Participative Water Governance: A Critical Analysis of Community Development Approaches. *Water (Switzerland)*. <https://doi.org/10.3390/w14050762>
- Sonbay, E. A. (2023). *Babinomics; Ekonomi Sosial Berbasis Babi* (1st ed.). CIRCA.
- Wijaksono, S. (2013). Pengaruh Lama Tinggal terhadap Tingkat Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Pengelolaan Lingkungan Permukiman. *ComTech: Computer, Mathematics and Engineering Applications*, 4(1), 24. <https://doi.org/10.21512/comtech.v4i1.2679>