Interdisciplinary Policy and Management
ILS Scientific Press, an Imprint of **CV. ILS NUSANTARA**
Volume 1, Issue 3, 2026. Pages 120-28
e-ISSN: 3165-2980
https://jurnal.ilsnusa.com/index.php/ipmpolicy

The Role of the Village Government in Increasing Community Participation in Development Implementation in Pattimpa Village, Ponre District, Bone Regency

Rika Puspita Sari[1]*, Muh Irvan Nur Iva[2], Herman H[3], Andi Asripan[4]
Public Administration Study Program, Universitas Negeri Makassar, Makassar City, Indonesia[1,2,3,4]
Email: rcapuspitasari@gmail.com; m.irvan.nuriva@unm.ac.id; hermandody@unm.ac.id; andi.asrifan@unm.ac.id*

ARTICLEINFO

Received: 15 October 2026
Revised: 28 October 2026
Accepted: 17 November 2026
Published: 26 November 2026

Keywords:
community participation; constraints; development; government role; village government

ABSTRACT

Community involvement is one of the key factors in the success of rural development. The village government is responsible for encouraging residents and giving them opportunities to take part in every stage of development, from planning to implementation. This study examines the role of the village government in promoting community participation and identifies the obstacles encountered during the development process in Pattimpa Village, Ponre District, Bone Regency. It employs a descriptive qualitative method with a field research approach. Data were collected through observation, interviews, and documentation, using both primary and secondary sources. The findings indicate that the village government mobilises and guides the community through coordination, deliberative meetings, the accommodation of public aspirations, and the setting of development priorities. Community participation takes the form of submitting proposals, joining development activities and cooperating through gotong royong (mutual assistance). However, participation has not been fully optimised because of ineffective information dissemination, limited funds, and varying levels of community awareness. Improving participation therefore requires effective coordination, open information, and closer cooperation between the village government and residents. The study offers input for village governments seeking a more transparent and participatory development process.

DOI **:** *https://doi.org/10.83835/4cbn0r33*

INTRODUCTION

Village development plays a central role in improving the living standards and welfare of rural communities. Its success depends not only on government programmes and budgets but also on the involvement of residents throughout the process. Law No. 3 of 2024, the second amendment to Law No. 6 of 2014 on Villages, grants village governments the authority to manage local governance and meet community needs (Republic of Indonesia, 2024). This authority obliges village governments to involve residents in planning, implementation and the evaluation of results. Village transfers under the Village Law have expanded the resources available for this purpose and have been linked to changes in rural employment and village enterprises (Arifin et al., 2020), yet their effective use is still constrained by officials' limited financial literacy, weak digital infrastructure, low public awareness and the low participation of groups such as youth (Ardiputra et al., 2025).

Research on Indonesian villages shows that participatory institutions do not automatically produce meaningful participation. A study using participatory rural appraisal found that development planning forums had yet to involve communities inclusively, because residents were represented mainly by village leaders closely aligned with the government and

were not involved continuously in the development process (Damayanti & Syarifuddin, 2020). Ethnographic research in eighteen villages found that village meetings often take place irregularly and remain elite-dominated, providing a venue for residents to express their views without imposing accountability on officials (Haryanto et al., 2025). A comparative analysis of the same villages revealed extreme variation in village governance regimes, shaped by local economic and sociocultural conditions (Aspinall et al., 2025). Syukri (2024) adds that participatory village governance has focused narrowly on the village economy and infrastructure and has neglected the poor and marginalised.

Transparency and communication are central to closing this gap. A survey of village governments in Yogyakarta found that transparency is positively associated with community trust (Sofyani et al., 2022). Communication matters as well, because village deliberation risks becoming a ceremonial ritual when it is used only to ratify decisions that have already been made (Zuhro et al., 2026). Studies of village development planning deliberations show that drawing residents into decision-making remains a challenge (Mustanir et al., 2022). Research in Indonesia also shows that public perceptions shape how participatory policies are implemented (Herman, Aslinda, et al., 2025), and that New Public Management reforms in rural institutions have left a persistent gap between transformative aspirations and implementation realities (Muttaqin et al., 2026b). Collaborative arrangements between village governments and communities have likewise been examined as a route to stronger village economic development (Halim et al., 2026).

Similar problems are found in Pattimpa Village, Ponre District, Bone Regency, where community participation in development has not reached the expected level. Attendance at the village development planning deliberation (Musrenbangdes) for the preparation of the village government work plan (RKPDes) has been below 50 percent. Participation in physical development, especially road and drainage works carried out through gotong royong, has also not been optimal. These conditions indicate that the village government's capacity to mobilise residents, both by providing facilities and by offering encouragement, needs to be strengthened.

These conditions call for further study of how the village government performs its role and what obstacles hinder community involvement. The study therefore addresses two questions: (1) How does the village government perform its role in encouraging community participation in development in Pattimpa Village, Ponre District, Bone Regency? (2) What factors hinder the village government in increasing community involvement in development activities? Accordingly, the study aims to examine the role of the village government in encouraging participation and to identify the constraints faced in implementing development in Pattimpa Village.

The study contributes to public administration scholarship on village governance and community participation. Whereas earlier studies have emphasised the formal design of participatory forums, this study focuses on how the village government actually performs its role and on the factors that limit participation in a specific village, adding evidence from Bone Regency, where field studies of village participation remain limited. The findings are expected to broaden understanding of the village government's role in building participation and to inform village governments in designing measures that make development more open and participatory.

METHOD

This study used a descriptive qualitative design with a field research approach to explain how the village government performs its role in encouraging community involvement in development. Qualitative research was chosen because it emphasises the depth of context and voice needed to understand the why and how of social behaviour (Lim, 2025). The study was conducted in Pattimpa Village, Ponre District, Bone Regency, and focused on how the

village government performs its role and on the obstacles to greater participation. Informants were the village head, village officials and residents involved in development activities, selected purposively according to their involvement in and understanding of the issues studied, so that the sample matched the aims of the research (Campbell et al., 2020). Interviews continued until new interviews no longer produced new issues, following empirical guidance on sample sizes for saturation in qualitative research (Hennink & Kaiser, 2022). Primary data came from interviews and direct observation of development activities, while secondary data came from village reports, photographic documentation and supporting records, an approach comparable to field studies of village meetings in Indonesia that combine ethnographic observation with records of the meetings themselves (Haryanto et al., 2025).

The data were analysed with thematic analysis. Data were first organised by research focus, then coded, compared across informants and sources, and grouped into themes, following a systematic step-by-step process that moves from codes to themes and finally to a conceptual explanation (Naeem et al., 2023). The analysis was conducted reflexively, with the researchers' interpretation treated as part of the analytic process rather than as a source of bias to be eliminated (Braun & Clarke, 2021). The researchers checked findings from interviews, observations, and documents against one another to strengthen credibility. Variation between villages in governance regimes (Aspinall et al., 2025) means that the results describe the situation in Pattimpa Village and are not intended to be generalised to all villages. On this basis, the study presents findings on how the village government performs its role, the extent of residents' involvement in development, and the obstacles affecting efforts to increase participation.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The Role of the Village Government in Encouraging Community Participation in Development

The Pattimpa Village Government encourages community involvement mainly through deliberative forums and coordination at the planning stage. The process begins with hamlet deliberations (musdus) and continues with a village deliberation (musdes) that discusses the needs of residents from nine hamlets. The input gathered is used to decide which activities should come first. The village head and village secretary stated that the process involves residents, hamlet heads and village officials. One recurring priority is the repair and construction of roads in several hamlets.

These conditions show that the village government coordinates competing interests and facilitates community involvement. Coordination appears in the collection of opinions and the convening of stakeholders, while facilitation appears in the opportunity given to residents to state their needs in the forums. Deliberation therefore means more than meeting procedural requirements; it is a means of aligning village government plans with community expectations. This reflects the view of participatory budgeting as a sequence of phases whose outcomes depend on how each phase is designed and on the roles of political and managerial actors (Bartocci et al., 2023). Hamlet heads and village officials act here as the government's representatives, and research on government representatives in the field shows that traits such as agreeableness and conscientiousness, together with carefulness, shape how well they perform (Idris et al., 2023).

The finding is consistent with Mustanir et al. (2022), who identify community involvement in decision-making as a key element in implementing village development planning deliberations and show that drawing residents into decisions remains a challenge. Damayanti and Syarifuddin (2020) likewise found that development planning forums in Indonesian villages have yet to involve communities inclusively, because residents are represented mainly by village leaders and are not involved continuously. Haryanto et al.

(2025) add that village meetings often provide a venue for residents to express their views without making officials accountable for the outcome.

The success of deliberation in Pattimpa should therefore not be measured by the number of meetings held or proposals collected. The more important measure is how residents' input is examined, used to set priorities and then realised in development programmes. The village government needs to give residents adequate space to express their views and to inform them about the progress and follow-up of their aspirations. The capacity of village staff also matters, since adequate operational work tools have been shown to improve employee productivity in public organisations (Taliang et al., 2023).

Community Involvement in Implementing and Maintaining Development Results

Residents of Pattimpa Village take part in development activities in the village. Community members and young people contribute labour to construction work and join gotong royong to maintain the environment. The village secretary explained that residents also help maintain completed facilities, particularly through regular cleaning and sanitation work in each hamlet. The village government also reported cooperation with other development programmes that open work opportunities for local residents.

This shows that participation does not stop once planning is complete but continues into implementation and maintenance. Participation in gotong royong reflects shared concern and responsibility for the environment and public facilities. Village development therefore requires not only the provision of infrastructure but also community support so that facilities remain in good condition and continue to deliver benefits. Research on planning and environmental policy similarly finds that community participation and multidisciplinary collaboration are essential to sustainable outcomes and that local communities should share in management and benefits (Herman, Wance, et al., 2025).

However, the information gathered does not show that residents evaluate development programmes through a planned mechanism. Participation in Pattimpa is most visible in labour contributions and maintenance, while oversight and evaluation are less developed. This pattern matches the finding that participatory village governance in Indonesia has concentrated on the village economy and infrastructure rather than on deepening village democracy (Syukri, 2024), and that sensitive issues such as gender relations have received little attention under this framework (Syukri, 2023). Haryanto et al. (2025) also show that village forums do not automatically increase accountability when residents lack space to object, criticise and monitor village governance.

The gotong royong tradition and residents' willingness to contribute labour are social strengths that the Pattimpa Village Government should continue to build on. Community involvement, however, should not be limited to physical work. Residents also need opportunities to monitor activities, assess results, and respond to the programmes implemented. Oversight can also take place outside formal forums, as shown in a study of collaborative environmental governance in a border district (Purna et al., 2026). Shifts in power towards citizens are most likely when reformers inside the state and organised citizens outside it reinforce one another (Fox et al., 2023), and collaborative arrangements between village governments and communities have been examined as a route to village economic development (Halim et al., 2026). Through broader involvement, residents can become central actors in development rather than helpers or recipients.

Information Openness and Communication as Factors Affecting Participation

Although the village government has held deliberations and encouraged participation, interviews revealed weaknesses in information dissemination and communication. Several residents said that information about development programmes did not reach the community evenly. Residents also questioned how openly the village government set priorities and implemented programmes. One informant, Waki, said that information was sometimes

poorly targeted and that announcements did not always match the conditions of development on the ground. Another informant, Mahadi, considered the village government's outreach to encourage participation inadequate.

The village government and some residents therefore assess participation differently. The village government believes residents have been involved in many activities, while some residents feel they have not received adequate information. This difference matters because deliberation alone does not ensure that every resident receives equal information or understands each stage of development.

From a good governance perspective, open information is a foundation of public trust. Sofyani et al. (2022), studying village governments in Yogyakarta, found that transparency is positively associated with community trust. Experimental evidence shows that providing citizens with detailed information about a participatory budget initiative improves their assessment of government performance and their political trust (Ardanaz et al., 2023). Administrative information disclosure has also been examined as a core element of village governance (Eritrina et al., 2026), and digital government tools have been studied as a means of building public trust in an Indonesian district (Ahmad et al., 2026). Yet transparency alone is not enough: an index-based study of rural Indonesia found that transparency and civil society engagement do not always translate into better infrastructure outcomes, and recommends deliberative, participatory, and data-driven village governance (Hakim et al., 2025).

Zuhro et al. (2026) warn that village deliberation risks becoming a ceremonial ritual when communication is used only to approve decisions already made, and they stress transparent leadership, communication that invites residents' views, and stronger social oversight. The communication problem in Pattimpa is therefore not only about announcing development activities but also about the quality of interaction between the village government and residents. When information is limited or unclear, residents struggle to understand the basis for priorities, the use of budgets and the progress of programmes, which can weaken trust and reduce willingness to participate. The village government needs two-way communication, accessible development information, and clear explanations of how residents' aspirations have been followed up.

Budget Constraints and Limited Community Awareness in Village Development

Besides communication problems, limited funds hinder development in Pattimpa Village. The village head explained that insufficient budgets have caused some plans and works to be postponed or not carried out as intended. Successful development therefore depends not only on the commitment of the village government and residents but also on adequate financial support. This is consistent with evidence that the effective use of Village Fund Allocation is constrained by officials' limited financial literacy, weak digital infrastructure, and low public awareness (Ardiputra et al., 2025), even though village transfers have expanded the resources available to villages (Arifin et al., 2020).

Another obstacle is residents' awareness of the need to participate. According to the village head, some residents have not shown sufficient concern or willingness to take part. Some informants, however, argued that the village government should be more active in outreach and in inviting residents to participate. This difference indicates that low participation cannot be attributed solely to a lack of willingness among residents; it also reflects the village government's capacity to communicate, disseminate information, and create opportunities for involvement. Public perceptions shape how participatory policies are implemented (Herman, Aslinda, et al., 2025), so how residents view the village government affects their readiness to take part.

This condition is in line with Mustanir et al. (2022), who show that village development deliberations still face challenges in engaging residents when decisions are made. Permatasari

et al. (2024) emphasise the need for more transparent and accountable village fund management and reporting systems, while weak accounting systems in village enterprises have been shown to undermine accountability to residents (Muttaqin et al., 2026a). Ardiputra et al. (2025) also report the low participation of groups such as youth in village budgeting.

Budget constraints and limited awareness are related but require different responses. Financial problems can be addressed by setting development priorities carefully, using budgets according to need, and disclosing information about their management. Raising awareness requires continuous outreach, direct communication with residents, and greater opportunities to contribute. Increasing participation therefore requires more than invitations to gotong royong; it also requires building trust and fostering residents' sense of ownership of village development.

Overall Findings

Overall, the Pattimpa Village Government has made several efforts to encourage participation through deliberations, coordination, involving residents in development, and maintaining facilities. These efforts have not been fully effective because of limited funding, ineffective communication, information that does not reach all residents, and differing assessments of participation between the village government and residents.

The success of the village government in increasing participation cannot be measured only by holding deliberations or organising gotong royong. Meaningful participation includes residents' involvement in stating needs, making decisions, implementing programmes, and monitoring and evaluating results. The quality of participation therefore depends on the village government's ability to build open relationships, present information clearly, and respond to residents' needs and input.

The findings support Damayanti and Syarifuddin (2020) and Haryanto et al. (2025), who show that formal participation mechanisms do not necessarily produce meaningful involvement. Participatory institutions can serve distinct and even opposite functions in interest intermediation, depending on the political project behind them (Mayka & Abbott, 2023), and reforms in rural institutions have left a persistent gap between transformative aspirations and implementation realities (Muttaqin et al., 2026b). This study adds a picture of how this gap appears in a single village government in Bone Regency. The village government has provided several channels for involvement, but communication and information openness need improvement so that opportunities to participate are felt more evenly. Syukri's (2024) observation that participatory village governance concentrates on the economy and infrastructure is relevant to Pattimpa, where participation is most visible in physical works such as roads and drainage.

Efforts to increase participation in Pattimpa should therefore focus on the quality of involvement rather than on attendance figures alone. The village government needs to ensure that every input from residents receives attention and follow-up, that development information is available to all residents, and that residents can oversee implementation. These steps are needed so that development reflects community needs and its implementation can be jointly accounted for.

CONCLUSION

The Pattimpa Village Government has taken several steps to encourage community involvement in development, including coordination, the provision of facilities and the organisation of hamlet and village deliberations that collect residents' views and set development priorities. Residents participate by submitting proposals, contributing labour to development works, and joining *gotong royong* to maintain completed facilities. Participation has not yet been optimal, however, because communication and information dissemination have not reached all residents, development funds are limited, and some residents' awareness

of the need to participate remains low. The study also found that the village government and residents assess the level of participation differently, which shows that holding deliberations does not by itself guarantee meaningful involvement. In practical terms, the village government should strengthen coordination, disclose development and budget information openly, maintain two-way communication, and explain the follow-up to every proposal so that residents can take part in decisions, oversight, and evaluation, not only in physical work. Because the study covers a single village, its findings cannot be generalized to other villages. Future research should extend to more villages and examine community involvement at each stage of development, particularly in the monitoring and evaluation of programme implementation.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank all individuals and institutions who supported this research and contributed to the preparation of this article.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

RPS: conceptualization, investigation, data collection, formal analysis, and writing–original draft preparation. MIN: methodology, validation, interpretation of findings, and writing–review and editing. HH: theoretical framework development, supervision, and writing–review and editing. AA: literature review, data curation, validation, and writing–review and editing. All authors have read and approved the final version of the manuscript.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest related to the research, authorship, or publication of this manuscript.

REFERENCES

Ahmad, E. A., Siraj, M. L., Suprianto, S., Asis, D., & Praja, M. E. I. (2026). Digital government transformation in building public trust in Makassar District. Interdisciplinary Policy and Management, 1(3), 1–14. https://doi.org/10.83835/cs4bg110

Ardanaz, M., Otálvaro-Ramírez, S., & Scartascini, C. (2023). Does information about citizen participation initiatives increase political trust? World Development, 162, 106132. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2022.106132

Ardiputra, S., Milyan, M., Akhmad, Z., Sulthan, M., & Ardiputra, M. A. (2025). Optimizing budget policy in village fund allocation (ADD): A governance and public administration perspective on rural development. Frontiers in Political Science, 7, 1581806. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2025.1581806

Arifin, B., Wicaksono, E., Tenrini, R. H., Wardhana, I. W., Setiawan, H., Damayanty, S. A., Solikin, A., Suhendra, M., Saputra, A. H., Ariutama, G. A., Djunedi, P., Rahman, A. B., & Handoko, R. (2020). Village fund, village-owned-enterprises, and employment: Evidence from Indonesia. Journal of Rural Studies, 79, 382–394. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2020.08.052

Aspinall, E., Berenschot, W., Savirani, A., & Ruhyanto, A. (2025). Analysing and explaining variation in village governance regimes across Indonesia. South East Asia Research, 33(1), 12–31. https://doi.org/10.1080/0967828X.2025.2483168

Bartocci, L., Grossi, G., Mauro, S. G., & Ebdon, C. (2023). The journey of participatory budgeting: A systematic literature review and future research directions. International Review of Administrative Sciences, 89(3), 757–774.

https://doi.org/10.1177/00208523221078938

Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2021). One size fits all? What counts as quality practice in (reflexive) thematic analysis? Qualitative Research in Psychology, 18(3), 328–352. https://doi.org/10.1080/14780887.2020.1769238

Campbell, S., Greenwood, M., Prior, S., Shearer, T., Walkem, K., Young, S., Bywaters, D., & Walker, K. (2020). Purposive sampling: Complex or simple? Research case examples. Journal of Research in Nursing, 25(8), 652–661. https://doi.org/10.1177/1744987120927206

Damayanti, R. A., & Syarifuddin. (2020). The inclusiveness of community participation in village development planning in Indonesia. Development in Practice, 30(5), 624–634. https://doi.org/10.1080/09614524.2020.1752151

Eritrina, E., Amalia, A. R., & Putri, A. A. A. (2026). Administrative governance and information disclosure in Siwolong Polong Village, Mattiro Sompe District, Pinrang Regency. Interdisciplinary Policy and Management, 1(3), 15–27. https://doi.org/10.83835/2yxnae30

Fox, J., Sullivan Robinson, R., & Hossain, N. (2023). Pathways towards power shifts: State-society synergy. World Development, 172, 106346. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2023.106346

Hakim, L., Kolopaking, L. M., Sjaf, S., & Kinseng, R. A. (2025). Assessing village democracy and welfare in rural Indonesia: An index-based correlation analysis. Frontiers in Political Science, 7, 1622507. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2025.1622507

Halim, D., Meilindah, M., Laily, A., & Wahdania, A. (2026). Collaborative governance in the economic development of the Long Nah Village community: An administrative perspective as a multidisciplinary and interdisciplinary field of study. Interdisciplinary Policy and Management, 1(3), 67–75. https://doi.org/10.83835/b3esvn78

Haryanto, Berenschot, W., & Aspinall, E. (2025). Participation without accountability: Deliberative democracy in village Indonesia. South East Asia Research, 33(1), 49–67. https://doi.org/10.1080/0967828X.2025.2483162

Hennink, M., & Kaiser, B. N. (2022). Sample sizes for saturation in qualitative research: A systematic review of empirical tests. Social Science & Medicine, 292, 114523. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2021.114523

Herman, H., Aslinda, A., & Jayadi, K. (2025). Public perceptions and participatory policy implementation in national development: The case of Indonesia's Gold Program. International Journal of Public Administration in the Digital Age, 12(1), 1–24. https://doi.org/10.4018/IJPADA.397345

Herman, H., Wance, M., & Syahidah, U. (2025). Meta-analysis of the relationship between ecotourism planning and environmental policy development: Research dynamics from 2015–2025. International Journal of Sustainable Development and Planning, 20(8), 3199–3210. https://doi.org/10.18280/ijsdp.200804

Idris, A., Sanjaya, A., Arhas, S. H., & Suprianto. (2023). Performance of volunteers in the socio-economic registration census as representatives of the government [Special issue]. Journal of Governance & Regulation, 12(4), 256–266. https://doi.org/10.22495/jgrv12i4siart5

Lim, W. M. (2025). What is qualitative research? An overview and guidelines. Australasian Marketing Journal, 33(2), 199–229. https://doi.org/10.1177/14413582241264619

Mayka, L., & Abbott, J. (2023). Varieties of participatory institutions and interest intermediation. World Development, 171, 106369.

https://doi.org/10.1016/j.worlddev.2023.106369

Mustanir, A., Yusuf, M., & Sellang, K. (2022). What determines the implementation of development planning deliberations in the village? IOP Conference Series: Earth and Environmental Science, 1105, 012029. https://doi.org/10.1088/1755-1315/1105/1/012029

Muttaqin, M. Z., Haris, H., Rifdan, Herman, & Kasmawati, A. (2026a). Debate: Towards accountability in the village enterprise accounting system. Public Money & Management, 46(1), 20–22. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2025.2520515

Muttaqin, M. Z., Haris, H., Rifdan, Herman, & Kasmawati, A. (2026b). Debate: NPM and the reproduction of power in rural enterprise institutions. Public Money & Management, 46(4), 502–503. https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2025.2579081

Naeem, M., Ozuem, W., Howell, K., & Ranfagni, S. (2023). A step-by-step process of thematic analysis to develop a conceptual model in qualitative research. International Journal of Qualitative Methods, 22. https://doi.org/10.1177/16094069231205789

Permatasari, P., Budiarso, A., Dartanto, T., Samosir, A. P., Saputro, B., Ekayana, D., Agustono, E. D., Alim, T. E., Hartono, L., Wahyuputri, F. W., & Wardhana, I. W. (2024). Village fund management and reporting systems: Are they accountable? Transforming Government: People, Process and Policy, 18(4), 512–528. https://doi.org/10.1108/TG-07-2023-0098

Purna, Z. A., Asis, D., Ismail, I., & Suprianto, S. (2026). Oversight beyond formal forums: Collaborative environmental governance of seaweed farming in a border district of Indonesia. Interdisciplinary Policy and Management, 1(3), 41–56. https://doi.org/10.83835/bwn02k60

Republic of Indonesia. (2024). Law No. 3 of 2024 on the Second Amendment to Law No. 6 of 2014 on Villages.

Sofyani, H., Pratolo, S., & Saleh, Z. (2022). Do accountability and transparency promote community trust? Evidence from village government in Indonesia. Journal of Accounting & Organizational Change, 18(3), 397–418. https://doi.org/10.1108/JAOC-06-2020-0070

Syukri, M. (2023). Gender policies of the new developmental state: The case of Indonesian new participatory village governance. Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs, 42(1). https://doi.org/10.1177/18681034221149750

Syukri, M. (2024). Neglecting the poor and marginalized: Participatory village governance in Indonesia's New Developmentalist state. Development Policy Review, 42(4), e12776. https://doi.org/10.1111/dpr.12776

Taliang, A., Rijal, S., Niswaty, R., Herman, & Arhas, S. H. (2023). Employee performance: The role of operational work tools toward productivity [Special issue]. Journal of Governance & Regulation, 12(3), 198–205. https://doi.org/10.22495/jgrv12i3siart1

Zuhro, R. S., Aziz, N. L. L., Susantyo, B. B., & Ika, S. (2026). When participation becomes ritual: Culture, communication, and village governance in Indonesia. Frontiers in Communication, 11. https://doi.org/10.3389/fcomm.2026.1850147