RESEARCH ARTICLE OPEN ACCESS

Baileo: Jurnal Sosial Humaniora
Volume 1, Issue 1 | September 2023
https://ojs3.unpatti.ac.id/index.php/baileofisip

BAILEO JURNAL SOSIAL HUMANIORA
e-ISSN 3026-3468
p-ISSN 3026-2593

Article info
Received manuscript:
30/08/2023
Final revision:
25/09/2023
Approved:
26/09/2023

This work is licensed under Creative Commons Attribution License 4.0 CC-BY International license

DECENTRALIZATION AND GRASSROOTS DEVELOPMENT: LOCAL PARTICIPATION AND ADMINISTRATIVE EFFICIENCY IN VILLAGE FUND MANAGEMENT IN EASTERN INDONESIA

Iana Zalili[1*], Pieter Sammy Soselisa[1], Julia Theresia Patty[1]
[1]Universitas Pattimura, Jalan Ir. M. Putuhena, Ambon 97233, Indonesia

[*]Correspondence E-Mail: ianazalili99@gmail.com
DOI: https://doi.org/10.30598/baileofisipvol1iss1pp15-27

ABSTRACT

This article aims to evaluate the utilization of Village Funds in the implementation of development programs in Poka Village, Teluk Ambon District, as part of the broader dynamics of decentralization and grassroots development in Eastern Indonesia. The study focuses on local participation and administrative efficiency in managing Village Funds. A qualitative descriptive approach was employed, with data collected through observation, in-depth interviews, and documentation. Ten purposively selected informants represented various key stakeholders within the village. Data analysis followed Miles and Huberman's interactive model, involving data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing. The findings indicate that the use of Village Funds in Poka Village has been effective, as evidenced by the high realization rate of development programs and adherence to plans formulated through participatory village planning forums. Community involvement throughout planning and implementation reflects a relatively strong participatory model, although challenges remain in terms of administrative capacity and consistent reporting. The novelty of this study lies in its emphasis on the relationship between fiscal decentralization structures and local participation dynamics in Eastern Indonesia—a region often overlooked in rural development literature. The study recommends strengthening village governance capacity and promoting more systematic community involvement to improve fund management effectiveness.

Keywords*: Administrative Efficiency, Decentralization, Grassroots Development, Local Participation, Village Fund*

INTRODUCTION

Decentralization has become one of the most transformative policies in the landscape of Indonesian governance in the post-reform era (Annahar et al., 2023; Talitha et al., 2020). Since the enactment of Law No. 6 of 2014 on Villages, the state has granted greater autonomy to villages to manage resources and determine their own development directions. One tangible manifestation of this policy is the allocation of Village Funds (Dana Desa), which are directly transferred each year to village government accounts. Behind the high hopes for local empowerment lies a fundamental question: to what extent does the management of Village Funds truly reflect administrative efficiency and citizen participation in building their own communities?

This question is crucial, as findings from studies by Arifin et al. (2020), Diprose et al. (2019), and Permatasari et al. (2021) indicate that large funding allocations do not always correlate with tangible community impacts. The Audit Board of the Republic of Indonesia (BPK RI) has, in various audits, continued to find irregularities in the reporting and use of Village Funds, ranging from non-participatory planning to weak governance capacity at the village level. On the other hand, the government positions villages as the front line in poverty alleviation and addressing development disparities. This means that the effectiveness of Village Fund management is not merely an administrative issue, but one that concerns the sustainability of community-based development.

Numerous prior studies have highlighted the implementation of Village Funds from various perspectives. For instance, Angelia et al. (2020), Hidayat et al. (2019), and Surachman (2020) emphasized the importance of institutionalization in participatory village planning. Meanwhile, Lele (2023) and Shoesmith et al. (2020) viewed the dynamics of decentralization as inseparable from local elite contestation, which can reproduce power inequalities. Research by Junaedi (2023) and Syukri (2023) underscored the tension between bureaucratic structures and participatory ideals in the management of Village Funds. In eastern Indonesia, studies by Hartojo et al. (2022) and Wahyuningsih (2021) showed that Village Fund management challenges tend to be more complex due to limited information access, low budget literacy, and lack of continuous technical assistance.

Other literature also highlights the variability in Village Fund management performance across regions. Diansari et al. (2023) observed that successful management is highly influenced by the leadership capacity of village heads. Research by Tresiana et al. (2023) pointed out the mismatch between administrative procedures and community aspirations in village deliberations. Mahendra et al. (2019) and Rizkianti et al. (2020) noted that the involvement of women and vulnerable groups in decision-making remains very limited. Conversely, research by Sambodo et al. (2023) and Sulistyawati et al. (2019) recorded the success of villages in Yogyakarta in developing community-based programs through Village Funds, though such success cannot be easily replicated in other regions with different geographic and social characteristics.

Studies by Lele (2019) and O'Grady (2019) suggested that decentralization often faces a dilemma between autonomy and accountability. In the context of eastern Indonesia, this dynamic is exacerbated by limited basic infrastructure and high regional fragmentation. Research by Ferdinandus (2022) and Ririhena & Ririhena (2023) on Village Funds in Southwest Maluku emphasized that geographical factors affect reporting and monitoring efficiency. Conversely, a study by Kania et al. (2021) showed that with a consistent participatory approach, villages in the eastern region can also create local innovations in fund management, despite limited resources.

These various literatures offer rich insights, yet most still focus on the contexts of Java and Sumatra. Meanwhile, eastern Indonesia—particularly Maluku—is often marginalized in both academic and policy attention. Few studies have deeply examined how fiscal decentralization truly functions in small villages in this region, especially regarding administrative efficiency and

citizen participation in planning their village futures.

In this context, this article seeks to fill a gap that has long been overlooked in the literature on decentralization and village development. It not only highlights how Village Funds are used but also explores how villagers, officials, and local social structures interact in decision-making and program implementation. Poka Village in Teluk Ambon Subdistrict is the focal point, representing the unique dynamics of coastal villages in eastern Indonesia: rich in social potential yet facing structural challenges in governance.

The objective of this study is to provide a comprehensive and reflective picture of how Village Funds are utilized in Poka Village, focusing on two main dimensions: community participation and administrative efficiency. Through this approach, this article not only fills the gap in eastern regional studies but also offers a new perspective on the success of village development—not merely in terms of budget absorption but in how the process revives collective spirit at the grassroots level.

RESEARCH METHOD

This study uses a qualitative descriptive approach, placing social reality as the central focus and viewing the phenomenon of Village Fund management as a meaning-construction shaped by local actor interactions (Priya, 2021). This approach is chosen to preserve the holistic portrayal of community participation practices and administrative efficiency, rather than reducing their complexity into separate variables. By placing the researcher directly in the field, the fieldwork allows for detailed exploration of planning, budgeting, and reporting processes of the Village Fund in the context of Poka Village. The selection of Poka Village, Teluk Ambon Subdistrict, is based on three main considerations. First, the geographical and social conditions of this village represent characteristics of coastal villages in eastern Indonesia, which have received limited empirical study. Second, accessibility—the village's proximity to the research team—facilitates repeated observation without sacrificing data depth. Third, preliminary exploration showed that Village Fund management dynamics in Poka are relatively distinctive: high program realization rates alongside internal audit reports that still require strengthening. The integration of these three factors makes Poka Village a strategic location to trace the linkage between fiscal decentralization and grassroots participatory practices.

Research informants were selected using purposive sampling, choosing those with deep understanding of Village Fund management processes (Fuster Guillen, 2019). There were ten informants: three village officials (Village Head “EVR”, Village Secretary “SS”, and Planning Officer “AC”) and seven residents involved in deliberations and program implementation. Initials are used to maintain confidentiality and research ethics. This selection ensures diverse perspectives—from policymakers and administrative implementers to beneficiaries—allowing the analysis to capture the dynamics of utility and challenges in Village Fund management.

Data were collected through in-depth interviews, participatory observation, and

document study. In-depth interviews allowed exploration of informants' motivations, perceptions, and obstacles, while participatory observation provided a real picture of community interactions during village deliberations and accounting processes at the village office (Darwin Holmes, 2020). Documentation—including minutes of development planning meetings, budget realization reports, and meeting notes—offered written evidence to complement field notes. Each stage of data collection was conducted sequentially and flexibly: initial interviews were enriched by direct observations during program implementation, then verified with documentary data.

To ensure the validity of findings, source and technique triangulation were conducted (Darwin Holmes, 2020). Source triangulation involved comparing the information from officials and residents, while technique triangulation combined interviews and documentation. For example, a resident's statement on the timeliness of fund disbursement was cross-checked with transfer receipts and meeting minutes. This triangulation process helped minimize subjective bias, enriched understanding, and strengthened the credibility of the research findings. All data were analyzed using the interactive analysis model by Fuster Guillen (2019), which involves stages of data reduction, data presentation, and conclusion drawing. Data reduction involved selecting relevant interview quotes and observation notes, data presentation was done using thematic matrices to visualize patterns of participation and efficiency, and conclusions were drawn by reviewing interrelated themes.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Effectiveness of Village Fund Utilization: Program Realization and Planning Consistency

The utilization of Village Funds in Poka Village, Teluk Ambon Subdistrict, shows a relatively effective implementation pattern, marked by high realization rates of development programs and consistency between initial plans generated through Village Development Planning Meetings (Musrenbang) and field implementation. This effectiveness can be assessed through two main parameters: the alignment between proposed and implemented programs, and the timeliness of implementation that contributes to achieving village development goals.

Theoretically, such budget realization effectiveness can be analyzed using the performance-based governance approach, which emphasizes the importance of performance accountability in the context of fiscal decentralization (Oikonomou, 2022). In this framework, the Village Fund is not merely a fiscal transfer tool but also a reflection of local institutional capacity to manage, implement, and account for every rupiah allocated for community welfare. Effectiveness, in this sense, is shown by the village government's ability to ensure that planning processes are participatory, structured, and directed toward achieving collectively defined development goals. Field observations in Poka Village revealed that most physical programs—such as construction of footpaths, drainage systems, and other public facilities—had been realized on schedule and with appropriate targets. One observed site was a hamlet in the eastern

part of the village, where a concrete path proposed through RT-level Musrenbang had been completed and is now used by residents to access gardens and places of worship. The physical structure of the road appeared neat, with construction involving local labor, indicating self-management practices as mandated by Minister of Finance Regulation No. 247/PMK.07/2015. In another area, such as the coastal zone, a completed water drainage project was observed, aimed at mitigating seasonal flooding—this project also originated from community proposals through the village deliberation forum.

The realization of community empowerment programs also showed positive results. The village government initiated skill training and micro-business programs targeting women and youth groups. These programs originated from community aspirations during RT meetings, were reinforced in Village Meetings, and finally included in the Village Government Work Plan (RKPDes). According to MK, a village official, program prioritization was based on field surveys assessing needs and urgency, and the results formed the basis for budget planning discussed in the village Musrenbang.

Consistency between planning and implementation was reflected in the structured bureaucratic planning stages conducted by the village government. EVR, the head of Poka Village, explained that the planning process began with pre-meetings at the RT level, continued to Village Meetings, the formulation of RKPDes, and then the determination of the Village Budget (APBDes). This tiered mechanism ensures that community voices are genuinely heard and translated into concrete programs. This was supported by A., the planning officer, who stated that the RKPDes was prepared based on priority needs emerging during Village Meetings. However, this effectiveness did not occur without challenges. One major obstacle identified was the delay in fund disbursement from the central government. According to EVR, this issue delayed the implementation schedule of several programs, although they were eventually completed within the same fiscal year. This administrative issue serves as a reminder that effectiveness at the village level is highly influenced by the efficiency of higher-level systems.

Community participation is a crucial component in ensuring the success of program planning and implementation. Most informants—village officials such as AMD and FL, as well as community figures like S. and D.—stated that the community was involved from the initial stages through deliberation forums. AMD emphasized that every emerging proposal is considered and included in the Budget Plan (RAB) before being submitted to the subdistrict and central authorities. However, this participation still faces challenges. Some residents, such as F., admitted that they were not fully aware of the types of development activities being or about to be implemented, indicating a communication gap that needs to be addressed.

Field conditions also revealed that development activities generally followed the self-management principle, as mandated by Village Law No. 6 of 2014. This allowed community involvement not only in deliberations but also in direct implementation—as laborers, local material suppliers, or technical workers. MK added that the support of local human resources and the village's strategic geographic location also accelerated implementation processes.

Local Participation in Program Planning and Implementation

Community participation in Poka Village in the planning and implementation of the Village Fund program shows a positive trend, although challenges remain in terms of quality and equity. Throughout various stages of village development, citizens have shown relatively active engagement, particularly during the Village Development Planning Meetings (Musrenbang). Observations during the 2022 Musrenbang revealed community involvement in proposing programs such as clean water provision, footpath repairs, and small business training. These forums are generally open, with residents seated in a circle at the village hall, some taking notes, responding to, and discussing development ideas. Such participation indicates the presence of a deliberative space at the local level.

Nevertheless, participation is not evenly distributed across all social groups in the village. Interviews with the Village Planning Officer (AC) and the Head of Empowerment Affairs (MK) revealed that the majority of active participants come from neighborhood heads (RT), religious figures, and middle-aged men. Conversely, the presence of women, youth, and the poor in official forums is minimal. These vulnerable groups often attend symbolically, without actively engaging in discussions or decision-making. For instance, during the 2023 village discussion forum, out of 30 recorded attendees, only five were women, and just two spoke. This suggests that while participatory spaces are procedurally available, not all residents can substantively express their interests equally.

This phenomenon aligns with Arkorful et al. (2022), who emphasize the importance of discourse quality, openness to arguments, and inclusivity in public decision-making. In the context of Poka Village, while forums like Musrenbang or the Village Government Work Plan (RKPDes) exist, they do not fully ensure egalitarian deliberation. Participation gaps—stemming from social structure, education levels, or cultural factors—limit certain groups from effectively contributing to local policy formation. The tendency of dominance by village elites, traditional leaders, or adult male groups reinforces what Luskin et al. (2022) describe as “deliberative distortion,” where one voice is louder and more influential than others.

Tabel 1 Composition of Participation in the Poka Village Musrenbang Forum

Participant Category	Average Number per Forum	Percentage (%)
Community Leaders (men)	12	40%
RT/RW Heads	8	27%
Adult Women	5	17%
Youth	3	10%
Poor Residents (identified)	2	6%
Total	30	100%

Source: Documentation of Poka Village Musrenbang, 2022–2023

This table highlights representational disparities among groups. Women and youth, who make up a significant demographic in the village, have the lowest participation rates. The poor—supposed to be the primary target of Village Fund interventions—are only marginally

represented. An interview with F., a housewife, confirms this: she claimed not to know when the Musrenbang was held and believed that village decisions "are usually already made by important people." This reflects structural and psychological barriers that make ordinary residents feel incapable or unentitled to participate in decision-making spaces.

Participation in the implementation stage also reveals similar dynamics. Several physical development projects, such as the construction of concrete roads and drainage systems, were carried out through self-management involving local labor. This allowed direct participation of residents as technical implementers. MK noted that the projects employed mutual cooperation to reduce costs and empower locals. However, this involvement is more technical than substantive. Major decisions like project location, budget allocation, and material procurement remain in the hands of village officials.

In the evaluation stage, citizen participation is still limited. Although accountability reports are available and publicly displayed, only a few residents respond or provide feedback. According to AMD, limited administrative literacy is a key barrier—most villagers do not understand the reports and tend to remain passive. This suggests that transparency does not automatically lead to accountability, especially when it lacks mechanisms to empower citizens to understand and use the information.

Administrative Capacity and Bureaucratic Challenges in Village Fund Management

In the broader framework of decentralization and grassroots development, the administrative capacity of village governments plays a crucial role in determining the success of Village Fund utilization. In Poka Village, Teluk Ambon District, while the implementation of development programs has generally followed participatory planning and shown a high rate of realization, administrative efficiency remains a key area of concern. The findings from this study indicate that village officials often face challenges in navigating bureaucratic processes, particularly in relation to documentation, financial reporting, and digital administrative systems required by higher levels of government.

During fieldwork in Poka, several informants—particularly those involved directly in the administrative and financial management of Village Funds—expressed that the complexity of reporting standards often exceeds their current technical capacities. One village official (S., a member of the financial affairs division) noted that while the program planning stage has been highly inclusive through the musrenbangdesa forum, "the real difficulty begins after the program starts—writing reports, uploading them, and making sure everything is aligned with regional regulations." This sentiment reflects a broader pattern in Eastern Indonesia where formal requirements are not always matched by local administrative readiness.

The reliance on external assistance from pendamping desa (village facilitators) also emerged as a double-edged sword. On one hand, facilitators play a valuable role in guiding village officials through complicated bureaucratic steps; on the other, their dominant involvement

sometimes reduces the autonomy of local actors. In several instances, facilitators were observed leading budget preparation discussions—tasks ideally led by the village apparatus themselves. This dynamic highlights a structural tension between empowerment and dependency within the decentralization framework.

Moreover, the bureaucratic system itself often lacks flexibility to adapt to the contextual realities of villages like Poka. For instance, unstable internet connectivity and limited access to digital tools delay timely submission of required documents, especially financial accountability reports. Observations during the research showed that while development projects such as road improvements and drainage systems were physically completed, the administrative follow-up—including online reporting—lagged behind, sometimes causing delays in the next phase of fund disbursement.

These challenges suggest that while participatory mechanisms in Poka Village are relatively well institutionalized, they are not yet fully supported by a robust administrative framework. This aligns with the theoretical perspective of Stober et al. (2021), who argues that decentralization often transfers responsibilities without proportionate capacity development, particularly in remote or underserved regions. Furthermore, Syukri (2023) concept of technological ambivalence can help explain the tension between embracing digital accountability and the difficulties it brings in low-capacity environments.

Towards Transformative Village Fund Governance

The practice of Village Fund management in Poka Village, Teluk Ambon District, reflects a complex dynamic between the transformative potential of fiscal decentralization and structural constraints that still hinder its effectiveness. This study underscores that while Village Fund management is not yet ideal, current practices reflect the early stages of a grassroots development model centered on participation and local sustainability. This potential lies in the growing institutional capacity of the village, the evolving (though uneven) citizen participation, and the openness of village government to evaluation and change.

Field observations show that decision-making spaces, such as Village Deliberation Forums and RT discussion meetings, are conducted openly in a simple yet functional village hall. Plastic chairs and long tables surround the area where village officials and community figures engage in dialogue. Budget information boards and photos of completed physical projects hang on the walls. The forums are typically informal yet attentive, where residents exchange responses and feedback on development proposals. This marks an active deliberative process, albeit not yet socially equal. As AC, a village official, noted, proposals from women or the poor are often not prioritized due to being perceived as unrealistic or “beyond budget capacity.” Such views reveal structural biases against voices deemed lacking in technocratic legitimacy.

Furthermore, interviews with MK, the head of community empowerment, revealed that many training programs have not reached marginalized groups such as female heads of households or school dropouts. This is due to limited accurate social data and weak cross-sector

collaboration in identifying community needs. In practice, training in baking, mechanics, or microenterprise management is often targeted at already socially established groups like the PKK or formal youth organizations. This raises the question of who is genuinely seen as the "villager" worthy of empowerment and who is excluded from development discourse.

On the reporting side, the village administrative system has shown improvement. Budget and accountability documents are publicly posted and shared via village WhatsApp groups. However, field observations found that most residents do not understand these documents. One resident, F., stated that she viewed them "as mere formalities," as the language was too technical and not directly explained by village officials. This shows that reporting remains administrative in nature and not yet a tool for social dialogue or citizen oversight of development policy. In this regard, Cosens et al. (2021) suggest that accountability must be contextual and allow active citizen engagement in reflective processes, not merely as recipients of information.

A key lesson from the Poka Village case is the urgent need to transform Village Fund governance from a purely administrative approach focused on budget compliance into a platform for strengthening the community's collective capacity. This change requires more than regulatory compliance; it demands a planned and participatory spirit of empowerment. According to Stober et al. (2021), such transformation leads to a governance model that synergizes three key elements simultaneously: citizen control over decision-making, strengthening of local administrative capacity, and continuous institutional learning. These three cannot operate in isolation if a village wants to move from a "project" paradigm to a "social system strengthening" paradigm.

In Poka Village, the initial step toward transformative governance can begin with needs-based training tailored to the actual conditions of residents. Such training should not be merely ceremonial or fulfill administrative obligations. Instead, it must be contextually designed, based on participatory social mapping that includes various societal layers and considers geography, gender, and socioeconomic vulnerability. These efforts can be reinforced through collaboration with universities or NGOs that are familiar with the area's sociocultural dynamics. This approach makes training a meeting point between local knowledge and technocratic expertise.

However, training alone is insufficient if residents do not feel incentivized or motivated to engage in planning and monitoring processes. Therefore, a second strategy involves promoting a fair and open participatory incentive scheme. For instance, the village government can offer small honorariums, participation certificates, or priority access to productive economic programs for residents who consistently participate in forums or monitoring teams. This scheme is not to pay for participation but to recognize citizens as development actors. More importantly, it also seeks to break the dominance of local elites and open space for historically subordinated groups in village deliberations.

A third equally important strategy is to develop a community-based reporting and monitoring system that is inclusive and easily accessible. Reporting should not remain as documents stored in village offices, but should also be presented visually and interactively so all

residents can understand them. For example, the village can use noticeboards or infographics in strategic locations such as village halls, markets, or places of worship. Involving youth and students as transparency volunteers can foster intergenerational engagement in strengthening social oversight. Such initiatives bridge the gap between information and action, between data and community awareness of public policies that affect their lives.

This study also contributes to broader thinking on the need to interpret fiscal decentralization contextually, especially in peripheral regions like Eastern Indonesia. While much national public policy research is still Java- or urban-centric, this study demonstrates that participation dynamics, infrastructure challenges, and local power relations in villages like Poka offer valuable insights into how policies work on the ground. Here, fiscal decentralization is not merely a technical matter of fund transfers but a process of shaping local actors who learn, negotiate, and pursue their own visions of development.

As observed in several evaluation forums, village officials in Poka have begun showing willingness to receive criticism and improve processes. Though still sporadic, this signals a shift toward more reflective governance. Transformative participation occurs when citizens are not only invited to attend but are also acknowledged as legitimate knowledge producers and decision-makers. If these conditions are strengthened through affirmative policies and capacity-building, it is entirely possible that villages like Poka could become laboratories of community-based, contextual policy innovation.

CONCLUSION

This study concludes that the management of Village Funds in Poka Village serves as a concrete reflection of how fiscal decentralization interacts with grassroots development dynamics in the local socio-political context of Eastern Indonesia. The findings show that decentralization should not be viewed merely as a mechanism of authority and budget transfer but as an opportunity to foster more democratic, participatory, and contextual village governance. While progress has been made in terms of citizens' substantive participation, involvement remains limited by social representation gaps, weak administrative capacity, and technocratic reporting. In answering the research objectives, the study affirms that bottom-up village development cannot be achieved through efficient administrative procedures alone but requires the institutionalization of inclusive and reflective deliberative mechanisms. The novelty of this research lies in emphasizing that effective decentralization involves not just fiscal devolution but also the redistribution of knowledge, power, and the right to shape the village's future—a perspective that positions the Village Fund as a field of social transformation, not merely a fiscal policy tool.

ETHICAL STATEMENT AND DISCLOSURE

This study was conducted in accordance with established ethical principles, including informed consent, protection of informants' confidentiality, and respect for local cultural values. Special consideration was given to participants from vulnerable groups to ensure their safety, comfort, and equal rights to participate. No external funding was received, and the authors declare no conflict of interest. All data and information presented were collected through valid research methods and have been verified to ensure their accuracy and reliability. The use of artificial intelligence (AI) was limited to technical assistance for writing and language editing, without influencing the scientific substance of the work. The authors express their gratitude to the informants for their valuable insights, and to the anonymous reviewers for their constructive feedback on an earlier version of this manuscript. The authors take full responsibility for the content and conclusions of this article.

REFERENCES

Angelia, N., Batubara, B. M., Zulyadi, R., Hidayat, T. W., & Hariani, R. R. (2020). Analysis of Community Institution Empowerment as a Village Government Partner in the Participative Development Process. *Budapest International Research and Critics Institute (BIRCI-Journal): Humanities and Social Sciences*, *3*(2), 1352–1359. https://doi.org/10.33258/birci.v3i2.991

Annahar, N., Widianingsih, I., Muhtar, E. A., & Paskarina, C. (2023). The Road to Inclusive Decentralized Village Governance in Indonesia. *Sustainability*, *15*(11), 8616. https://doi.org/10.3390/su15118616

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/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jrurstud.2020.08.052

Arkorful, V. E., Lugu, B. K., Hammond, A., & Basiru, I. (2022). *Decentralization and Citizens' Participation in Local Governance BT - Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance* (A. Farazmand (ed.); pp. 2930–2946). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-66252-3_4237

Cosens, B., Ruhl, J. B., Soininen, N., Gunderson, L., Belinskij, A., Blenckner, T., Camacho, A. E., Chaffin, B. C., Craig, R. K., Doremus, H., Glicksman, R., Heiskanen, A.-S., Larson, R., & Similä, J. (2021). Governing complexity: Integrating science, governance, and law to manage accelerating change in the globalized commons. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, *118*(36). https://doi.org/10.1073/pnas.2102798118

Darwin Holmes, A. G. (2020). Researcher Positionality - A Consideration of Its Influence and Place in Qualitative Research - A New Researcher Guide. *Shanlax International Journal of Education*, *8*(4), 1–10. https://doi.org/10.34293/education.v8i4.3232

Diansari, R. E., Adiza Alhassan, M., & and Binti Othman, J. (2023). Factors affecting village fund management accountability in Indonesia: The moderating role of prosocial behaviour. *Cogent Business & Management*, *10*(2), 2219424.

https://doi.org/10.1080/23311975.2023.2219424

Diprose, R., McRae, D., & Hadiz, V. R. (2019). Two decades of reformasi in Indonesia: its illiberal turn. *Journal of Contemporary Asia*, *49*(5), 691–712.

Ferdinandus, sherly. (2022). Analysis Of The Effect Of Village Fund Allocation And Perkapita Expenditure On Human Development Index In Tanimbar Islands Regency 2015-2019. *Asia Pacific Journal of Business Economics and Technology*, *2*(06 SE-Articles), 1–13. https://doi.org/10.98765/apjbet.v2i06.89

Fuster Guillen, D. E. (2019). Qualitative research paradigm, a key research design for educational researchers, processes and procedures: A theoretical overview. *Propósitos y Representaciones*, *7*(1), 201. https://doi.org/10.20511/pyr2019.v7n1.267

Hartojo, N., Ikhsan, M., Dartanto, T., & Sumarto, S. (2022). A Growing Light in the Lagging Region in Indonesia: The Impact of Village Fund on Rural Economic Growth. *Economies*, *10*(9), 217. https://doi.org/10.3390/economies10090217

Hidayat, R., Hendra, H., & Iptidaiyah, M. (2019). The Steep Road to Institutionalizing Negotiable Governance in the Management of Village Development. *Journal of Governance*, *4*(1). https://doi.org/10.31506/jog.v4i1.5369

Junaedi, J. (2023). Implementation of Village Governance Based on Principles of Good Governance of Public Service in Indonesia. *International Journal of Business, Law, and Education*, *4*(1), 249–266. https://doi.org/10.56442/ijble.v4i1.160

Kania, I., Anggadwita, G., & Alamanda, D. T. (2021). A new approach to stimulate rural entrepreneurship through village-owned enterprises in Indonesia. *Journal of Enterprising Communities: People and Places in the Global Economy*, *15*(3), 432–450. https://doi.org/10.1108/JEC-07-2020-0137

Lele, G. (2019). Asymmetric Decentralization and the Problem of Governance: The Case of Indonesia. *Asian Politics & Policy*, *11*(4), 544–565. https://doi.org/10.1111/aspp.12493

Lele, G. (2023). Asymmetric decentralization, accommodation and separatist conflict: lessons from Aceh and Papua, Indonesia. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, *11*(5), 972–990. https://doi.org/10.1080/21622671.2021.1875036

Luskin, R. C., Sood, G., Fishkin, J. S., & Hahn, K. S. (2022). Deliberative Distortions? Homogenization, Polarization, and Domination in Small Group Discussions. *British Journal of Political Science*, *52*(3), 1205–1225. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0007123421000168

Mahendra, I. G. A. A., Siswanto Agus, W., Sukamdi, & and Putra, I. G. N. E. (2019). The role of decision-making pattern on the use of long-acting and permanent contraceptive methods among married women in Indonesia. *The European Journal of Contraception & Reproductive Health Care*, *24*(6), 480–486. https://doi.org/10.1080/13625187.2019.1670345

O'Grady, W. (2019). Enabling control in a radically decentralized organization. *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*, *16*(2), 224–251. https://doi.org/10.1108/QRAM-07-2017-0065

Oikonomou, G. (2022). *Decentralizing Governance BT - Global Encyclopedia of Public Administration, Public Policy, and Governance* (A. Farazmand (ed.); pp. 2999–3003). Springer International Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-66252-3_3918

Permatasari, P., Ilman, A. S., Tilt, C. A., Lestari, D., Islam, S., Tenrini, R. H., Rahman, A. B., Samosir, A. P., & Wardhana, I. W. (2021). The Village Fund Program in Indonesia: Measuring the Effectiveness and Alignment to Sustainable Development Goals. *Sustainability*, *13*(21), 12294. https://doi.org/10.3390/su132112294

Priya, A. (2021). Case Study Methodology of Qualitative Research: Key Attributes and Navigating the Conundrums in Its Application. *Sociological Bulletin*, *70*(1), 94–110. https://doi.org/10.1177/0038022920970318

Ririhena, K., & Ririhena, M. (2023). Juridical Analysis Of The Headman's Authority In Village Fund Management (Case Study Of Law Number 6 Of 2014 Concerning Villages In Lolotwara Village, Lakor District, Southwest Maluku Regency). *JURNAL RUANG HUKUM*, *2*(2 SE-Artikel), 63–68. https://doi.org/10.58222/juruh.v2i2.743

Rizkianti, A., Afifah, T., Saptarini, I., & Rakhmadi, M. F. (2020). Women's decision-making autonomy in the household and the use of maternal health services: An Indonesian case study. *Midwifery*, *90*, 102816. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.midw.2020.102816

Sambodo, M. T., Syarif, H., Atika Zahra, R., Felix Wisnu, H., Chitra Indah, Y., Achsanah, H., Purwanto, P., Joko, S., Umi Karomah, Y., Mochammad, N., & and Astuty, E. D. (2023). Towards a New approach to community-based rural development: Lesson learned from Indonesia. *Cogent Social Sciences*, *9*(2), 2267741. https://doi.org/10.1080/23311886.2023.2267741

Shoesmith, D., Franklin, N., & Hidayat, R. (2020). Decentralised Governance in Indonesia's Disadvantaged Regions: A Critique of the Underperforming Model of Local Governance in Eastern Indonesia. *Journal of Current Southeast Asian Affairs*, *39*(3), 359–380. https://doi.org/10.1177/1868103420963140

Stober, D., Suškevičs, M., Eiter, S., Müller, S., Martinát, S., & Buchecker, M. (2021). What is the quality of participatory renewable energy planning in Europe? A comparative analysis of innovative practices in 25 projects. *Energy Research & Social Science*, *71*, 101804. https://doi.org/https://doi.org/10.1016/j.erss.2020.101804

Sulistyawati, S., Dwi Astuti, F., Rahmah Umniyati, S., Tunggul Satoto, T. B., Lazuardi, L., Nilsson, M., Rocklov, J., Andersson, C., & Holmner, Å. (2019). Dengue Vector Control through Community Empowerment: Lessons Learned from a Community-Based Study in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, *16*(6), 1013. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijerph16061013

Surachman, E. N. (2020). An Analysis of Village Fund Implementation in Central Java Province: An Institutional Theory Approach With a Modeling Institutional Aspect. *Indonesian Treasury Review: Jurnal Perbendaharaan, Keuangan Negara Dan Kebijakan Publik*, *5*(3), 203–215. https://doi.org/10.33105/itrev.v5i3.204

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), 110–133. https://doi.org/10.1177/18681034221149750

Talitha, T., Tommy, F., & and Hudalah, D. (2020). Welcoming two decades of decentralization in Indonesia: a regional development perspective. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, *8*(5), 690–708. https://doi.org/10.1080/21622671.2019.1601595

Tresiana, N., Duadji, N., . P., . S., & Damayantie, A. (2023). Deliberative Democracy Innovations at Citizen Level: Challenges of Local Government in Indonesia. *Lex Localis - Journal of Local Self-Government*, *21*(4), 807–832. https://doi.org/10.4335/21.4.807-832(2023)

Wahyuningsih, T. (2021). The Implication of Village Funds Utilization Towards Poverty in Maluku Province. *KAMBOTI: Jurnal Sosial Dan Humaniora*, *2*(1), 66–75. https://doi.org/10.51135/kambotivol2issue1page66-75