



PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE IN REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLANNING: A CASE STUDY OF THE REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT PLAN DELIBERATION OF BARRU REGENCY

Aenun Rijal Alwiah^{1*}, Mohamad Thahir Haning², Muh. Tang Abdullah³

Abstract

The development planning system based on participatory governance is a development planning system that involves the active participation of the Barru Regency community in Tanete Rilau Subdistrict, Pao-Pao Village in the process of planning, implementing, and monitoring development results. This research aims to participatory governance in the regional development planning of Barru Regency in Tanete Rilau Subdistrict, Pao-Pao Village. This study used qualitative research methods with descriptive research. Data collection techniques were carried out through observation, in-depth interviews, and documentation. The data were analyzed using the analysis model of Creswell with data collection techniques, analysis, and preparation of the report. The results showed that participatory governance in the regional development planning system of Barru Regency in Tanete Rilau District, Pao-Pao Village, using the participatory governance approach (Fung & Wright, 2001) which consists of Deliberation, Action, Monitoring, Centralised Coordination and Power, School of Democracy and Outcomes, namely the lack of socialization between central government stakeholders to the regions, thus causing GAP or misleading and more massive workshops are needed so that the system in the development planning process can reach an effective point.

Keywords: Development Planning Consensus, Participatory Governance, Regional Development

^{1*}Public Administration, University of Hasanuddin, Indonesia, Email: aenunrijal@gmail.com

²Public Administration, University of Hasanuddin, Indonesia, Email: thahir.haning@gmail.com

³Public Administration, University of Hasanuddin, Indonesia, Email: muhtangabdullah@yahoo.co.id

***Corresponding Author:** Aenun Rijal Alwiah

*Public Administration, University of Hasanuddin, Indonesia, Email: aenunrijal@gmail.com

I. INTRODUCTION

Participatory governance is a perspective that connects social concepts and responsibilities to individuals, communities, and governments, facilitating the decision-making process. In development, participatory governance aims to empower people and communities by involving them in policy-making through broad participatory interventions. Moser and Sollis (1991) suggest that such interventions can improve empowerment overall. The planning model for building participatory governance democratically requires preferential participation of the community in policy determination.

This development planning system explains that national development planning is needed to run effectively and efficiently to ensure development activities. The development plan involves compiling an annual development plan that includes indicative programs designed to achieve the vision and mission of the regional government. This plan is carried out at the grassroots level, known as Bottom-Up Planning, which requires

local governments to involve the community. By using this system, external sector resources are utilized as much as possible to minimize public problems.

Empirical research on policy analysis of development planning has considered rational social capital as the relationship and interrelationship between group members, which can be utilized to solve public problems by utilising various groups and related public organizations (Moser 1996; Narayan 1995). The study also addresses social problems identified by Schafft (1998) and Varshney (2000) by utilising probability to provide a description.

Based on the results of the research by Aenun Rijal Alwiah (2019) on Participatory Governance in regional development planning deliberations, the administrative dimensions of the Musrenbang process, both internal and external, have not been effective engaging stakeholders in the regional development planning process. This lack of effectiveness is attributed to the underdeveloped

involvement of external stakeholders in the Musrenbang process.

This study focuses on examining the role of social capital in strengthening participatory governance during regional development planning meetings (Musrenbang) in Barru District, Tanete Rilau Sub-district, Pao-Pao Village. Musrenbang is a national agenda conducted annually by the Barru District Government at the lowest level of government, from the village to the district level, similar to other regions. Through research on participatory governance (Fung & Wright, 2001), we aim to describe and explain the effectiveness of social capital in enhancing participatory governance during the development planning process in this area.

II. RESEARCH METHOD

The type of research used is qualitative research, specifically a study that describes participatory governance in regional development planning deliberations in Barru District. The data source obtained in this writing is primary data which is data obtained directly from the source, namely from the informants concerned by conducting direct interviews and observations. The informants were the head of Bappeda and their staff, the sub-district head and their staff, the village head, as well as community and business actors in Barru district, Barru sub-district, and Tante Rilau sub-district.

III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Strategy based on participant input: When deliberative decisions call for complex processes, participatory government planning with principles to design governance as a deliberative democratic practice and a source of concrete goals is required. Governance in development planning results from social inclusion, which encourages democracy as a local development planning process. In the Empowered Deliberative Democracy quotation (Fung and Wright, 2001), the matrix is explained in an ambiguous and imprecise way by defining three basic rules that are vital to the overall objective. To examine the participatory governance process, the researcher used the following approach (Fung & Wright, 2001):

1. Deliberation

The stages of this aspect are expressed by decision-making stages and the ideas of stakeholders as the main ideas in the decision-making process. The process must be properly tested as a fair assessment-based on public

problems that need to be resolved. The decisions that are important to the community should not only benefit a few parties and should be formulated from ideas at the individual and group levels.

2. Action

Collective decisions that have been carried out deliberatively do not necessarily mean that the proposals and decisions have been said to be democratic. It is important to understand the extent to which the results of the deliberative process have been successfully transformed into actual social activities and to establish accountability mechanisms that are transparent and communicated to the relevant stakeholders.

3. Monitoring

It is crucial to monitor how the program ensures that public involvement focuses on resolving public policy issues (as in a referendum) or electing a candidate (as in an election). It is important to determine the capacity of deliberative bodies to oversee the implementation of the results of deliberative decisions, refers to public participation to achieve accountability and evaluate the ability of stakeholders to achieve objectives.

4. Alleged Benefits of Centralized Coordination and Power

The coordination mechanisms between other organizational units need to be evaluated in an empirical manner to determine how effectively these processes function in practice. This will form a system of approaches that will facilitate institutions in forming effectively.

5. Schools of Democracy

Deliberative democracy must include marginalized people who are unconnected or have limited participation capabilities. The program aims to improve individuals' deliberative skills through exercises by practicing argumentation, planning, and evaluative capacities.

6. Outcomes

The empirical objective is to assess deliberative institutions and stakeholders based on previous performance results and the outcomes of decisions in the Musrenbang. Develop strategies and public action solutions that are superior to the previous ones, and evaluate whether this results in a more innovative generation of ideas.

Based on the results of interviews conducted using

the participatory governance approach (Fung & Wright, 2001), it has been found that stakeholders have been carrying out development planning activities as per requirements. However, considering the needs of the community, there are certain layers of society that have not been able to participate in the Musrenbang process due to inadequate socialization efforts by the stakeholders. Furthermore, the lack of training and socialization topics related to development planning has been particularly detrimental to marginalized communities. This underscores the importance of effective planning governance, which can serve as a reference point for resolving public issues.

IV. CONCLUSION

Based on the results of interviews and observations in research conducted using the participatory governance approach (Fung & Wright, 2001), it can be concluded that there is a lack of coordination between district government agencies and village governments regarding human resource training and information feedback systems related to decision-making in Tanete Rilau Sub-district, Pao-Pao Village, and Barru Regency. This lack of coordination has led to the inequitable realization of government programs, as some community groups in several RT/RW areas have been given higher priorities than others. Moreover, the absence of evaluation report facilities for the community has resulted in an overlap in the development planning process between several RT/RW areas. This issue needs to be addressed to ensure that government programs are run optimally and benefit the community as a whole.

References

1. Akbar, A., Flacke, J., Martinez, J., & van Maarseveen, M. F. A. M. (2020). Participatory planning practice in rural Indonesia: A sustainable development goals-based evaluation. *Community Development*, 51(3), 243–260.
2. Almakaeva, A., Moreno, A., & Wilkes, R. (2021). *Social capital and subjective well-being: Insights from cross-cultural studies*. Springer.
3. Ayers, J., Huq, S., Wright, H., Faisal, A. M., & Hussain, S. T. (2014). Mainstreaming climate change adaptation into development in Bangladesh. *Climate and Development*, 6(4), 293–305. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17565529.2014.977761>
4. Biesbroek, R., Peters, B. G., & Tosun, J. (2018). Public bureaucracy and climate change adaptation. *Review of Policy Research*, 35(6), 776–791. <https://doi.org/10.1111/ropr.12316>
5. Borden, L., & Serido, J. (2009). From program participant to engaged citizen: A developmental journey. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 37(4), 423–438.
6. Brian, K. (2007). *OECD Insights Human Capital How what you know shapes your life: How what you know shapes your life*. OECD Publishing.
7. Cornwall, A., & Gaventa, J. (2017). Participation in governance. In *International Development Governance* (pp. 405–413). Routledge. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4324/9781315092577-22>
8. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches*. SAGE Publications, Incorporated.
9. Creswell, J. W., & Creswell, J. D. (2018). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed*
10. Dany, V., & Lebel, L. (2020). Integrating concerns with climate change into local development planning in Cambodia. *Review of Policy Research*, 37(2), 221–243. *deliberative democracy for public administration*. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 40(4), 376–399. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074009356467>
11. Denhardt, J. V., & Denhardt, R. B. (2016). The new public service: Serving, not steering. *Diakses pada 9 april 2021 dari* https://barrukab.bps.go.id/indicator/23/34/1/ke_miskinan.html
12. Ebdon, C., & Franklin, A. L. (2006). Citizen Participation in Budgeting Theory. *Public Administration Review*, 66(3):437(447).
13. Faried Ali (2011) *Teori dan Konsep Administrasi: Dari Pemikiran Paradigmatik Menuju Redefinisi Nabatchi*, T. (2010). *Addressing the citizenship and democratic deficits: The potential of*
14. Fischer, F. (2006). Participatory governance as deliberative empowerment. *The American Review of Public Administration*, 36(1), 19–40. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0275074005282582>
15. Flanagan, C. (2003). Trust, identity, and civic hope. *Applied Developmental Science*, 7(3), 165–171.
16. Fung, A., & Wright, E. O. (2001). Deepening Democracy: Innovations in Empowered Participatory Governance. *Politics & Society*, 29(1), 5–41.
17. Hawes, D., Rocha, R., & Meier, K. (2013).

- Social capital in the 50 states: Measuring state-level social capital, 1986–2004. *State Politics & Policy Quarterly*, 13(1), 121–138. <https://barrukab.bps.go.id>. (2022, 9 April) Data series subyek Kemiskinan.
18. Indonesia. Undang-Undang Nomer 25 Tahun 2004 Tentang Sistem Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional
19. Isa Baud, Karin Pfeffer, John Sydenstricker-Neto, Dianne Scott (2011) . Developing Participatory 'Spatial' Knowledge Models in Metropolitan Governance Networks for Sustainable Development
20. Lacombe, C. (2020). Bridging city environments: A contextual approach to the mobilisation of immigrant groups. *Urban Studies*, 58(9), 1940–1956.
21. Larson, R. W., & Walker, K. C. (2006). Learning about the “real world” in an urban arts youth program. *Journal of Adolescent Research*, 21(3), 244–268. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0743558405285824>
22. Lerner, R. M., Lerner, J. V., Almerigi, J. B., Theokas, C., Phelps, E., Gestsdottir, S., Naudeau, S., Jelicic, H., Alberts, A., Ma, L., Smith, L. M., Bobek, D. L., Richman-Raphael, D., Simpson, I., Christiansen, E. D., & von Eye, A. (2005). Positive youth development, participation in community youth development programs, and community contributions of fifth-grade adolescents. *The Journal of Early Adolescence*, 25(1), 17–71. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0272431604272461>
23. Manaf, A., Setiyono, B., Wahyudi, I., Fisher, M., & Yuzal, H. (2016). Implementing pro-poor planning and budgeting: A case study of government-community poverty alleviation partnership in Pekalongan City, Indonesia. *International Journal of Sustainable Society*, 8(4), 302.
24. Manaf, A., Setiyono, B., Wahyudi, I., Fisher, M., & Yuzal, H. (2016). Implementing pro-poor planning and budgeting: A case study of government-community poverty alleviation partnership in Pekalongan City, Indonesia. *International Journal of Sustainable Society*, 8(4), 302. methods approaches. SAGE Publications, Incorporated.
25. Neil Adger, W., Arnell, N. W., & Tompkins, E. L. (2005). Successful adaptation to climate change across scales. *Global Environmental Change*, 15(2), 77–86. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2004.12.005>
26. OECD. (2018). OECD green growth studies building resilient cities an assessment of disaster risk management policies in Southeast Asia: An assessment of disaster risk management policies in Southeast Asia. OECD Publishing.
27. Phadke, R., Manning, C., & Burlager, S. (2015). Making it personal: Diversity and deliberation in climate adaptation planning. *Climate Risk Management*, 9, 62–76. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.crm.2015.06.005>
28. Pierre, J., & Peters, B. G. (2000). Governance, politics and the state. Macmillan Pub Limited.
29. Putnam, R. D. (2000). Bowling alone. Proceedings of the 2000 ACM Conference on Computer Supported Cooperative Work - CSCW '00. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1145/358916.361990>
30. Qualitative research (journal). (2008). In *The SAGE Encyclopedia of Qualitative Research Methods*. SAGE Publications, Inc. <http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781412963909.n355> Retrieved May 19, 2022, from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230347793.0011>
31. Rijal Alwiah, A. (2019). Participatory Governance Dalam Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah. Participatory Governance Dalam Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah.
32. Roberts, J. (2006). Limits to communities of practice. *Journal of Management Studies*, 43(3), 623–639. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-6486.2006.00618.x>
33. Shybalkina, I. (2021). Toward a positive theory of public participation in government: Variations in New York City’s participatory budgeting. *Public Administration*.
34. Stahl, G., & McDonald, S. (2019). Social capital and self-crafting: Comparing two case studies of first-in-family males navigating elite Australian universities. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 26(1), 93–108.
35. Tong, D., Wu, Y., MacLachlan, I., & Zhu, J. (2021). The role of social capital in the collective-led development of urbanising villages in China: The case of Shenzhen. *Urban Studies*, 58(16), 3335–3353.
36. Willems, S., & Baumert, K. (2003). Institutional capacity and climate actions. Oecd environment directorate international energy agency.
37. Woolcock, M., & Narayan, D. (2000). Social capital: Implications for development theory, research, and policy. *The World Bank Research Observer*, 15(2), 225–249. <https://doi.org/10.1093/wbro/15.2.2>