

Deliberative Democracy Innovations at Citizen Level: Challenges of Local Government in Indonesia

NOVITA TRESIANA, NOVERMAN DUADJI, PAIRULSYAH, SUWARNO
& ANITA DAMAYANTIE

CORRESPONDENCE ADDRESS: Novita Tresiana, Dr., Professor, Universitas Lampung, Department of Public Administration, Soemantri Brojonegoro 1 Bandar Lampung, Lampung Province, Indonesia, e-mail: novita.tresiana@fisip.unila.ac.id. Noverman Duadji, Dr., Professor, Universitas Lampung, Department of Public Administration, Soemantri Brojonegoro 1 Bandar Lampung, Lampung Province, Indonesia, e-mail: noverman.duadji@fisip.unila.ac.id. Pairulsyah, Master of Law, Associate Professor, Universitas Lampung, Department of Sociology, Soemantri Brojonegoro 1 Bandar Lampung, Lampung Province, Indonesia, e-mail: pairulsyah.1963@fisip.unila.ac.id. Suwarno, Master of Law, Associate Professor, Universitas Lampung, Department of Sociology, Soemantri Brojonegoro 1 Bandar Lampung, Lampung Province, Indonesia, e-mail: suwarno.1965@fisip.unila.ac.id. Anita Damayantie, Master of Law, Associate Professor, Universitas Lampung, Department of Sociology, Soemantri Brojonegoro 1 Bandar Lampung, Lampung Province, Indonesia, e-mail: anita.damayanti@fisip.unila.ac.id.

[https://doi.org/10.4335/21.4.807-832\(2023\)](https://doi.org/10.4335/21.4.807-832(2023))
ISSN 1581-5374 Print/1855-363X Online © 2023 Lex localis
Available online at <http://journal.lex-localis.press>.

Abstract This paper examined the roadmap for deliberative democracy development through village-level regional development planning forums in Indonesia and connected it with the strength of traditions and local values of a region. Roadmap innovations can solve problems and increase governance capacity. This study aimed to identify innovation challenges & factors affecting the innovation environment; using a qualitative method with a case study design. As a result, innovation is able to increase interaction and agreement on solving public policy problems and improve local government governance capacity. The challenge was determined by the open leadership, responsive village leadership behavior. Forums transform as a formal dialogue space and media for the contestation of knowledge with informal meetings in the community. The community traditions are present, recognized, valued through institutionalizing local institutions, local actors, and features that drive democracy in community consultation and cooperation. Several factors affecting the innovation environment included legal culture and policy, political & administrative environment, government & civil servant traditions. The government needs to carry out institutional conversions along with changes from the government, deliberation spaces, & communities to achieve these two goals.

Keywords: • deliberative democracy • village planning • innovation environment • local government

1 Introduction

In several Asian countries, including Indonesia, deliberative democracy has become the focus and target of change due to the long tradition of democratic settings, which continues today. Liberal democracy demonstrations and the use of certain deliberative democratic model tendencies by government regimes at the village level have been enacted without considering the historical practice of traditional and local deliberations. One of the interesting theoretical views of change is a perspective that illustrates how deliberative democratic tools can solve problems and increase government capacity (Qin and He, 2021).

This paper discussed deliberative democracy in village-regional development planning forums in Indonesia. Its function is an instrument for producing deliberative policies (Klintman, 2009) and essential instruments for achieving the value of local democracy development as the benefits for the community (Ravazzi, 2017).

This problem is crucial because the Indonesian government is committed to implementing village autonomy development policies through a shift in procedural and representative democracy towards deliberative democracy. It can be seen by enacting Law Number 6 of 2014, which states the basis for changes in village governance by making dignified, strong, and independent villages (Croissant and Lorenz, 2018). Based on this law, there are changes in the fundamental aspects of village management, including village position, authority, development, finance and assets, economy, and democracy (Sutiyo et al., 2017). The most revolutionary change was implementing village democracy through village forums, one of which was the village-level regional development planning forums (Musrenbangdes). It is the highest forum for deliberation of village strategic problems and programs, a means of achieving prosperity through public policy, and the most genuine democratic value at the local level (Djafar et al., 2019).

The term village democracy is related to the state's recognition and respect for the village, covering aspects of its history, organization, and ability, particularly recognizing and respecting the values that become the identity of the village community in the form of manners, morals, and procedures (Nurlinah & Haryanto, 2020). Local institutions can be understood at three levels: localities, communities, and groups. The three of them indicate a group of people who have the characteristics of interacting or communicating with each other (Kusumastuti, 2017). Thus, village democracy is a deliberative democracy guided by values deeply rooted in communities that interact or communicate in village consultations and cooperation (Antlöv et al., 2016). This community characteristic still exists and lives in the village, so the deliberation forums mandated by the Village Law are the

foundation for local democracy that has lived and been rooted in the village and is not imported (Nurlinah et al., 2020).

Research on deliberative democracy through village-level regional development planning forum models is numerous and varied. Several local studies in Indonesia, for example, showed that deliberative democracy could improve both the formulation and amendments of public policy results (Nas et al., 2019; Vel & Bedner., 2015). For example, studies conducted in several villages in Indonesia, including West Java Province, covering Sukabumi Regency, Bandung Regency, and Sumedang Regency (Nurjama, 2015), and Lampung Province covering South Lampung, Pesawaran, Tanggamus, and Central Lampung (Duadji & Tresiana, 2016) showed that deliberative democracy in public dialogue and debate as a process for the issuance of public policy has two benefits: First, it can reflect good administration and governance, is transparent, and open. Second, it has positive implications in promoting ideal matters concerning good citizenship and advanced democracy such as participation, empathy, and justice.

The results of previous studies stated that deliberative democracy could improve regional and local development policies. Found that the forum was able to encourage the issue in several inclusive child-friendly villages, protection development policies for marginalized groups, including groups of women, children, the elderly, and people with disabilities, community initiatives in Village-Owned Enterprises, and traditional villages (Duadji & Tresiana 2016, Nas et al., 2019). This condition happens because the full participation and involvement of the community are not only to produce public policy products that focus on the interests and needs of the people at large, but it will be more effective than policies made in private without deliberation in its implementation. The deliberate design stage will positively affect improving the quality of policies and better outcomes (Young, 2017).

The explanation above shows a positive form of deliberative democracy development at the local level, but several other results of studies did not support this development. Other evidence from several regions in Indonesia showed that it was counterproductive in its implementation. For example, adopting a deliberative democratic route into representative democratic practices in the deliberation room for policymaking impacted elitist village policies due to the dominance of the government and local elites (Fritzen, 2007). The adoption of a deliberative democratic route in deepening democracy (liberal democracy) is related to political practices in the form of direct village head election contests, village parliaments, expansion of village areas, and the management of village assets resulting in conflicts between communities and the government after prolonged direct village head elections and village parliaments (Jupesta et al., 2020), corruption as a result of the enormous cost of direct village head elections (Berenschot, 2018), and the

cost of proposing regional expansion (Lutpiah et al., 2017). All of these issues created distrust of the village government. The practice of representative democracy and deepening democracy (liberal democracy) is process-oriented and procedural, not the result of democracy, resulting in pseudo-democracy, a setback in political, social, and economic democracy, including the degradation of village democracy (Adenskog, 2018; Carpini et al., 2004).

The development and implementation of deliberative democracy that had been implemented previously require recovery through innovations that are increasingly perceived to be significant for the realization of the values and benefits of the welfare of society, which have attracted increasing attention not only from scholars but also policymakers. Meanwhile, it is admitted that only a few have explored the relationship between the results of democratic development and policy innovation. The roadmap for developing deliberative democracy connects with the strength of traditions and local values of a particular region.

This study focused on ensuring the success of innovation in developing deliberative democracy through village-level regional development planning forums. The local democracy model is deliberative and based on local strengths and traditions and a mandate of Village Law Number 6 of 2014. Two previous democratic development routes provide a roadmap for liberal democracy that promotes the procedure and applies equally to all regions and countries. Meanwhile, through the previous regulation, which is the policy of Law Number 32 of 2004 concerning Regional Government, it provides a route for developing representative democracy in villages, in the form of a Village Consultative Body as a representative institution and formal deliberation in the village. The village autonomy law still maintains the position of the Village Representative Body. Still, its primary mandate is not on the institution but on its deliberative model for determining strategic issues in the village.

Contrary to local values and impacts, management alienates community participation and initiatives and displaces the fundamental rights of local communities (Ban et al. 2012; Baogang 2012; Reedy et al. 2020; Tresiana & Duadji 2016a, 2016b). The problem also arises that the village/local democracy model has been a local tradition over generations, which has long been weakened by both the representative democracy model and the liberal/imported (procedural) democracy. It has resulted in the continued dependence of deliberation forums on formal institutions directly controlled by formal elites and anti-democratic local village elites (Duadji & Tresiana, 2016; Kusumastuti, 2017).

Therefore, this study tried to fill in the gaps by examining the process of innovation in developing a deliberative democracy roadmap between the two previous roadmaps, including the roadmap of liberal democracy and the roadmap of

representative democracy. Innovation in the deliberative democracy in developing new forms and governance processes becomes an alternative roadmap to build and improve relations between stakeholders/actors in village-level regional development planning forums (Musrenbangdes). The way the stakeholders relate, interact, and collaborate is radically changing (Wu et al., 2020). Changes in the value of local democracy are considered necessary by the community, starting from increasing community access, participation and empowerment, transparency, accountability, and equality (Kusumastuti 2017), and realizing benefits through eminent public policies, which requires an environment that can be a driving force for innovation (Bocatto & Perez-De-Toledo, 2020; Ionescu & Eliantonio, 2021; O'Malley et al., 2020). This study aimed to answer the problems encountered in implementing the village-level regional development planning forums and the challenges of achieving the innovation environment for the village-level regional development planning forums roadmap. This study is presented: The first part is the problem and the challenge of the innovation in developing a deliberative democracy roadmap through the village deliberation forum model. The second part is the factors that influence the innovation environment.

To answer these questions, we conducted a study using interviews from 2015 to 2018 with key informants in ten villages in South Lampung Regency, Lampung Province, Indonesia. The ten villages represent the character of coastal villages as well as traditional villages and disaster-prone villages. The informants consisted of local government, legislative groups, community groups, local traditional leaders, NGOs, universities, and communities. The South Lampung Regency and the informants were selected as a case study to represent the region's character in Indonesia. Those villages have solid traditions and values, uniqueness in the structure and traditions of the Saibatin Tribe indigenous people group of Lampung who lives and is dominant in the setting of economic and social life as well institution of the Saibatin indigenous people group forum. It can be a representation of democratic practices in the village and accordance with research needs, in the form of the availability of deliberation room which has strong roots in the life of the village community, local values that have been practiced for a long time, and have institutionalized the democratic order of the dialogue process in the manners, ethics, and the rule of law (Djafar et al., 2019).

2 Literature overview

2.1 The importance of deliberative democracy and policy innovation

In the last three decades, well-functioning deliberative democracy has been of great importance in many countries. Many believe that deliberative democracy under the proper conditions w to broaden perspectives, encourage tolerance and understanding between groups, and promote public values (Lalor & Hickey, 2013;

Shortall, 2021). In some countries, deliberative democracy is associated with preference formation (Hahn, 2018; Montpetit et al., 2004), empowerment of marginalized groups (García Agustín, 2012; Lehtonen, 2006; Montpetit et al., 2004), mediation of differences (Simon-Kumar, 2018), deep integration and solidarity (Drew, 2019; Gulakov & Vanclay, 2019), increase in recognition (Andanda, 2019), generating opinions and policies (Kondrashov, 2018), and leading to special agreements (Little, 2018; Ma, 2017; Renwick et al., 2018; Simon-Kumar, 2018). Regarding public policy, the deliberative democratic model is critically used to investigate the quality, substance, and rationality of the arguments and reasons brought up in defense of the public policy. Matters relating to evaluating public institutions, forums, places, and public spaces as justification and accountability for deliberation are essential policy support (Renwick et al., 2018; Zhang, 2019).

There is a shift in policy science from an expert center to the inclusion of citizens in policy debates (Fischer, 2010; Fischer & Gottweis, 2013). The study of deliberative policy has two views: the procedural approach and the design of a place to develop policies and deliberation as a substantive policy. Evidence from the Oregon region, United States, for example, illustrated the procedural form through a national deliberation forum (Lehtonen, 2006; Montpetit et al., 2004), initiatives and deliberative democracy towards innovative forms of marginalized groups (Mannarini & Fedi, 2018), growth of citizen conferences, citizen panels, and citizen juries sponsored by local, state, and national governments, and a growing number of private groups dedicated to community deliberation (Holst & Moe, 2021; Verdiesen et al., 2018). In practice, the initiatives of Oregon in publicly funded health care, National Problem Forums of the Kettering Foundation on education, and Fishkin's experiment in Deliberative Opinion Polls were examples of deliberative development in a procedural and design viewpoint (Kondrashov, 2018). However, several studies found weaknesses in procedures and site design, designed to improve and facilitate deliberation rather than proper management and decision-making (Hurst et al., 2018). The second view uses the deliberation model to produce substantive policies. In designing deliberation forums, scholars have four purposes, including increasing legitimacy through accountability and participation; fostering a public-minded perspective on policy issues through cooperation; promoting mutual respect between parties through inclusion and citizenship, and improving the quality of decisions (and opinions) through information and substantive debate (Clutton, 2018; Retno & Asra'I, 2018). The substantive deliberation model involves citizens at every stage of policy, research, and discovery stages by offering governance to solve problems by inviting citizens to resolve policies cooperatively (Ritter et al., 2018).

Lewanski (2020) through a case study in the Tuscany region, Italy, provided other facts in the form of empirical deliberative validity testing, the effects and possible benefits of institutionalizing deliberative democracy, and formulating a specific

policy innovation model that allows government and stakeholders to coexist, mutually strengthening. Some of the potentials of this Tuscany region included: social capital and citizenship (Bocatto & Perez-De-Toled, 2020), a distinctive and solid political culture inspired by the values of democracy and solidarity, a very high level of political participation, and a rich grassroots network of associations (Chaskin et al., 2012). Improving the quality of deliberative democracy is carried out by institutionalization Law Number 69 the Year 2019. It contains proactive actions to promote community involvement in local and regional decision-making, in dialogue with community groups and stakeholders in decision-making on various public issues and problems. Complex social mechanisms, cohesion, and negotiation architecture between government and critical citizens are essential components of policy innovation. The innovative character of the law is not only in its specific content but also in the policy formulation process.

The innovation in deliberative democracy is a successful implementation of new ideas that can change the structures and processes of democratic governance (Siddiqui et al., 2021). The core idea is to connect citizens to decision-making and policymaking processes. There are two general aspects of innovation: institutions directly engage citizens; innovation is standardized from option. Citizens have a formal role in policy, legislative or constitutional decision-making (Borov et al., 2017). The study of innovation practices showed that the process requires the ability and willingness of stakeholders to collaborate, connect, and share ideas, knowledge, and experiences outside the boundaries of traditional organizations and exchange essential exchange refers to a relatively free and interactive exchange of knowledge, information, and experiences, in which new ideas and concepts are discussed within and inter-organizational networks (Filatova & Volkovskii, 2020). Given this fact, innovation can improve the implementation of deliberative democracy development, partly depending on the institutional conversion process that reflects the government's capacity to relate, interact, and collaborate.

2.2 Deliberative democracy through village-level regional development planning forum models in indonesia

The development of deliberative democracy in villages began with Law Number 32 of 2004 concerning Regional Autonomy, previously Law Number 5 of 1979 concerning Village Government, villages experienced systemic paralysis in the form of a social gap ecological damage. Vulnerable community because social institutions were controlled by corporate political policies and the bankruptcy of villages and indigenous peoples. The decentralization policy through regional autonomy aims to promote village reform by placing the weight of development planning power in the regions to allow initiatives from below. The community will get a position. It is then recognized as the regional development planning forum (Musrenbang) model, which combines political, technocratic, and participatory

approaches. It is expected that the absorption of local aspirations will ultimately come from the grassroots. Unfortunately, this regulation has weakened the system in the village through several conditions, including the village's position under the local government with limited authority and as the implementer. It weakens the village's democracy threatens the village development as a market and supra village project. Village finance and assets use a fragmented budget approach. The deliberative democracy roadmap through the Village Consultative Body becomes the foundation for representative politics and democracy in the village (Tresiana & Duadji, 2016b).

Changes in the position of villages through Law Number 6 of 2014 are concerning Villages and the support of the Regulation of the Minister of Villages. The development of disadvantaged and transmigration area-based Number 21 of 2020 concerning General Guidelines for Development and Empowerment of Village Communities has provided a new roadmap for developing an alternative deliberative democracy. The presence of two regulations facilitates community participation through village deliberations (Musdes) as an arena where contestations and conflicts of interest are encountered to produce consensus. Village deliberations can also generate consensus from struggling and negotiating the interests of village stakeholders. The measure is that the deliberation forum can produce the Village Medium-Term Development Plan product, later derived into the Working Plan of Village Government, which then concretely budgeted in the Village-Level Regional Budget and Expenditure Plan. Thus, the village at a particular level is highly autonomous. It has the authority to make strategic decisions, plan, budget, implement, and supervise development performance and an arena for the growth and development of an increasingly fluid interaction with government power. As a unit of a legal community, the two regulations position the village as a hybrid organization between self-governing communities and local self-government, which distinguishes the village administration model from other governments.

Several deliberative democratic practices in some villages in Indonesia have shown distinctive uniqueness, including the emergence of community participation and initiation, which contains a combination of the roles of figures (local and customary), awareness of fundamental rights, and social capital, which is a vital force as a factor in the village democratic environment. Moreover, a leadership style that shifts towards being open, committed, and responsive becomes an opportunity to innovate village public policies that are more pro-people. The presence of BPD with its primary mandate to institute a deliberative democratic model for determining strategic issues in the village has made this representative institution voice and fight for the interests of the villagers.

3 Research

This study used a qualitative case study design. It was chosen to answer the why and how questions, especially when a failure relates to forming and governance (Yin, 2018). This design allows in-depth exploration of the problems encountered in implementing the village-level regional development planning forum and the ideal roadmap for its implementation.

This study used in-depth interviews, which recommend two-way oral communication between the researchers and the research subject. More specifically, it can understand profound social phenomena and their reasons, interpreting assurances on the actions of people who are observed (Creswell, 2014). The research interview was semi-structured, and the topics were explained only as a guide. We invited the informants to describe the practices of deliberative democracy through the previous Musrenbangdes, the obstacles they faced, and the roles of Village Representative Bodies, government, and community groups as well as custom. The data in this study were obtained through interviews with key informants from 10 villages consisting of: Way Muli, Way Muli Timur, Rajabasa, Tejang Pulau Sebesi, Batu Balak, Merak Belitung, Kalianda, Suak, Pardasuka, and Tarahan Villages. Some of the key informants we interviewed included: 1) ten traditional leaders and ten community leaders to gain views on the practice of democracy; 2) ten members of the Village Representative Bodies as legislators to get views on deliberation and participation; 3) twenty residents; 4) central and local government; 5) NGOs, and 6) universities. We also collected secondary data such as government reports and some relevant

regulations. The interviews were recorded and encrypted, mainly to ensure the reliability and diversity of the data. Methods proposed by Miles & Huberman (1994) were applied for content analysis through data reduction, display, and verification. The researchers triangulated data sources from various sources (local communities, government offices, social institutions, and universities) (Creswell, 2014). The interview transcripts were double-checked, with field notes to verify data integrity.

4 Discussion

4.1 Problems and Challenges for the Innovation of Village-Level Regional Development Planning Forums

This section contains problems and challenges in realizing innovative deliberation forums in ten villages in South Lampung Regency, Indonesia. We interviewed communities, traditional leaders, community leaders, government, NGOs, and universities. We asked them to rank obstacles/problems in the village deliberation

forum to describe the form and governance. Overall, we obtained the biggest obstacles in the form of formal deliberation institutions, such as deliberation spaces provided by the village government, the behavior of village leadership (village heads and Village Representative Bodies), and governance of initiatives. The detailed explanation is as follows:

Responsive and open village leadership behavior is very important in determining public interests and ensuring the arena of formal public space and expansion of informal public space as a new public space arena. Meanwhile, at the other extreme, village leadership can close opportunities to form public interests and tend to be exclusive (marginalization) for public issues in the village. On the other hand, this kind of leadership also opens inclusivity (openness) for public aspirations, such as fundamental public service issues and other public issues.

Of the ten villages in South Lampung Regency that we surveyed and interviewed, six of them including Way Muli, Way Muli Timur, Rajabasa, Tejang Pulau Sebesi, Batu Balak, Merak Belitung Villages, stated that there was still domination of Local Strong People and Kinship Politics in village leadership behavior. The interview results found an old legacy of village leadership rooted in two things: the conservative-bureaucratic leadership model, kinship politics, and the domination of local elites/(strong) people through paternalistic culture. Some forms of village leadership behavior included:

1. The reasonableness of the village heads and their relatives in enjoying access to resources supplied by the state through various subsidy mechanisms, for example, agricultural production facilities (such as seeds, fertilizers, and pesticides), various capital-intensive agricultural patterns, village land, including fishing equipment and marine resource development programs;
2. Some of the implementations of village government programs were mediated by the interests of local elites at the village level who controlled primary economic sources in the village;
3. Several positions resulted from internal democracy indirect elections for the village head to be obtained by one family line or a group of families.
4. Several practices of conservative leadership behavior, ranging from opportunistic (stealing opportunities, moral hazard) to local thuggery styles, concentrate on administrative matters rather than innovating to make breakthroughs in government, public services, and village development models.

On a different side, the four villages we interviewed, including Kalinda, Sauk, Pardasuka, and Tarahan Villages, described situations of leadership behavior that further encouraged the democratization process. Although it does not always result in practices that can be considered to be fully democratic, the tendency for open and responsive leadership was increasingly visible. Several villages showed a village

lifestyle supported by a communitarian spirit through the tradition of cooperation and local traditional values. Tradition has been going on for a long time and has become an essential part of social relations in society. If traced further, cooperation as a local customary value has become social energy for rural communities, including dealing with crises in the community.

Leadership resulting from the old pattern and direct elections with a non-substantive deliberative personality and character has resulted in weak village capacity, making village government institutions becoming bureaucratic machines and not involving themselves in public matters, including limiting deliberation room for village-level regional development planning forums. The kinship politics of both family and local elite figures adhered to a culture of being reluctant to criticize elites who hardly allowed the push for change from below. This culture led to weak community initiative in the deliberation room, especially in exercising control over village government and other public affairs.

On the other hand, village leadership used cooperation as an informal public space where motions and ideas related to public affairs in the village are discussed. Through this informal public space, the interaction between village institutions and the community took place. Public aspirations were present during community cooperation, such as proposals for disaster mitigation, using village funds, overcoming marine waste, environmental-based tourism, and managing marine and coastal resources. The presence of this informal public space eventually becomes a new form of the deliberative room, with the character of almost non-existent power asymmetry. The community feels more accessible to convey their aspirations through this space than the more formal regional development planning forums. The expansion of new public space forms needs to be accompanied by governance to accommodate community initiatives into the formal deliberation arena through village-level regional development planning forums and their institutionalization into public policy in the village.

4.2 Institutional deliberation room

All of the villages and participants we interviewed mentioned the increasing awareness of villagers about daily problems as a public problem. Several strategic issues discussed in ten villages consisted of public services, disasters, conflict, education, health, environment, natural resources, economic empowerment, and the like. However, the results of the interviews suggested that it was not easy for residents to bring these daily conversations to become policy issues at the village level, particularly in formal village-level regional development planning forums. One of the causes was the obstruction of the formal representation channel by the Village Representative Body (BPD). The traditional representation route in the form

of Musrenbangdes by formal village institutions was not yet fully capable of being a reliable channel in guarding the community's aspirations.

The results of the interview found that the factors causing the limitations of BPD representation were rooted from:

1. The existence of normative and formalistic reasoning in managing the diversity of the will of its community. The villagers' aspirations were only placed as inputs (suggestions) only in the arena of policymaking, without encouraging the opening of village deliberation rooms. Many community's interests did not have a place to be voiced;
2. The presence of a culture of patronage, patriarchy, and feudalism was a severe challenge that must be answered in carrying out the mission of transforming village democracy;
3. As a formal representative institution, the Village Representative Body was faced with problems that had distorted the space for delivering the increasingly inclusive interests of communities in the village. Several institutional capacity problems were mainly contributed by technocratic inability weak political awareness of the community representatives in carrying out the mission of strengthening participation in democracy regarding strategic decision making.

Institutions established and grown from local historical traditions have a flexible, adaptive character and provide intimacy to transcend the community's social barriers and leaders. Experience in South Lampung Regency has provided evidence of the role of indigenous groups and their forums in: managing ethnic conflicts (Balinese and Lampung tribes) in 2012 and mitigating the 2018 tsunami disaster that occurred in South Lampung, Indonesia. All villages interviewed explained that there was an informal representation route that they believed in and a new form of representation channel established from community initiation forums, one of which was dominant in ten villages in South Lampung Regency called the Saibatin Indigenous People Forum. Unfortunately, this wealth in the form of social capital has not been adequately utilized as an alternative channel capable of strengthening the deliberation process in the ten villages. The village community perceived the presence of informal channels as an alternative to the limitations of formal institutional channels and, at the same time, as a support for the work of democracy that served the community's interests. The villagers expected to revive and maintain these informal institutions by recognizing the existing informal institutions as assets in restoring village democracy.

4.3 Community initiative in village democracy space

The participants we interviewed mentioned the solid and weak community initiatives and active community participation concerning strategic village affairs, starting from the plan of policy-setting processes. Policy formulation related to the

way villagers responded to public issues in the village and how the community took advantage of village democracy space with various styles or characteristics of village government. The findings in ten villages illustrated that the livelihood of community initiatives related to traditional community groups (traditional institutions) with community consultation media, which had become a tradition rooted for decades, was a valuable modality in gathering aspirations so that the initiative could be accumulated in official deliberation forums.

The crucial public issues that required various community initiatives, particularly in the ten research area villages, were ethnic conflict, conservation, utilization of natural resources (coastal and marine), and natural disaster mitigation to improve their welfare. Experiences in ten villages that were observed showed that this issue was a medium for deliberative democracy. The sensitivity of the issues often results in dissatisfaction conflict, and the handling cannot be left solely based on community initiative. The village government must be responsive as the party with authority to create equitable conflict resolution for all villagers. The villages had channeled community initiatives in the village-level Musrenbang and informally through villagers' engagement (active interaction) with the village government. The role of the traditional Saibatin leaders was central in community initiatives and conflict management. Community forums are a conducive socio-political environment, playing an essential role in generating community initiatives. Six villages, dominated by the village head or other elites, had relevance to poor community initiatives. Therefore, as a counterweight to the strength or dominance of the village elite, it required the strength of civil society or active citizens who actively participated in the management of natural resources and village assets and the management of the village as a whole. In the long term, the results of active community engagement with a combination of these articulation pathways provide opportunities to promote social inclusion. Some cases have shown that innovations driven by their groups have contributed significantly to improving the economy and welfare.

4.4 Discussion

The increasing interest among policymakers regarding innovation in developing deliberative democracy by adopting local values and traditions encourages the importance of innovation for village-level regional development planning roadmap. Various government strategies have been launched for recovery in South Lampung Regency (Duadji & Tresiana 2016; Tresiana & Duadji, 2016a). Some researchers have tested this many times, but the research focused more on the description of the policy (Airaksinen & Albrecht, 2019; Vos et al., 2018). In general, the innovation in the development of deliberative democracy in Indonesia has two development directions, consisting of first, innovation from substantive results in terms of productivity/outcomes to be achieved, so that certain target groups can perceive by

overcoming problems faced by the community and those that affect their daily life; second, innovation in local democratic values in the form of increasing public access, participation and empowerment, transparency, accountability, and equality (Borov et al., 2017; Schafer, 2016).

The discussion begins with a description of the problems as challenges in establishing innovation in the development of deliberative democracy through regional development planning forums. The first problem was related to the challenge of conducive village leadership behavior to innovation in the *Musrenbangdes*. Leadership behavior in open and responsive villages affects how to view the public interest, expand deliberation room, and inclusiveness (Ma, 2017; Young, 2017). The leadership style of the village head who is responsible, committed, and sensitive to the voices and needs of the community that meets the ability of the Village Representative Bodies (BPD) to aggregate the interests of citizens is a vital asset to fight for the interests of the community (Kepramareni et al., 2020). Open leadership behavior and the role of the responsive representative body in some villages could ensure a new form of expansion of public space by creating informal public spaces in the village, which can successfully manage active initiatives of its community, open inclusiveness, and make community aspirations the primary consideration to take strategic decisions in the village.

The second problem was related to the challenge of the weak channel of the formal village representative institution, which was the Village Representative Body. Expanding community access to engage and influence strategic village decisions in *Musrenbangdes* was an important issue and required the encouragement of responsive and open leadership of village heads and BPD (Duadji & Tresiana, 2016; Jupesta et al., 2020; Kusumastuti et al., 2020). The weak capacity of the BPD was due to issues of political and technical-managerial capacity in the form of the knowledge support of its members, the level of understanding of village policies, and the political position of the BPD, which was very dependent on the village government (Bebbington et al., 2006; Kepramareni et al., 2020). The use of informal representation channels through traditional institutions, community forums, social groups in village communities, social organizations to community meetings was a local tradition that became a cultural innovation that expanded public space and reached by almost all social strata of society, had become a trigger for improvement of community initiatives, a new way, and mechanism for managing the negotiation of interests so that they influenced village policies. Some awareness of the principles of good governance and policy capacity, the limitations of representative institutions, required the transformation of the *Musrenbangdes* as a formal arena into a room for complaints and a media for contesting knowledge with the support of informal forums in the community (Madyan et al., 2020).

The third problem was related to villagers' initiative in managing village governance, which was an opportunity and a challenge in encouraging the growth and development of substantive democracy at the level of community initiatives. Encouragement of community groups through the role of traditional Saibatin leaders, communities, youth, and the arena of community cooperation and community consultation, had become a local tradition and a valuable modality in gathering aspirations that could be accumulated in village planning deliberation forums (Karim & Thiel, 2017). Proper and organized processing can create emancipatory leverage that assists build joint work and engagement between parties in the village (Vel & Bedner, 2015). In the case of the villages of South Lampung Regency, it showed that innovation driven by community groups had proven to contribute to improving the economy and welfare in absolute terms and local values.

As stated in the Village Law, the village autonomy policy has positioned Musrenbangdes as the highest forum for deliberation on village strategic issues. Village planning deliberations as a manifestation of the concept of deliberative democracy have solid roots and become the values living in local communities in Indonesia. The institutionalization of the order established from the dialogue process has been implemented in three forms: manners, ethics, and the rule of law. The essence of the three orders strongly reflects the values of democracy. Manners are manifested in a culture of tolerance, openness, equality, mutual trust, responsibility, care, and political competence. It means that they have inherited democracy at a cultural level (Pattiasina et al., 2020; Sukmawati, 2019). At the procedural level, village communities always have standardized procedures for making decisions, electing leaders, and articulating community interests. There are four main functions of deliberation in the tradition of rural communities in Indonesia, including as a method for exchanging opinions, thoughts, and feelings in the problem-solving process; tools for making decisions about the needs of living together; a form of people's sovereignty, an arena for citizens to maintain their attitudes, thoughts, and behavior in managing the potential in their environment; the last, the state philosophy, as stated in the fourth principle of Pancasila that reads democracy guided by the inner wisdom in the unanimity arising out of deliberations among representatives.

The deliberative forums as local democracy have historical relevance for communities to deliberate the will of the Village as Law (Rachma et al., 2019; Sukmawati, 2019). The challenge of implementing the previous village democracy, which was based on representative and procedural democracy on the one hand and the infertile local/village democracy required changes and innovations in the roadmap of new forms and better governance so that it can be a tool for correcting the implementation of previous democracy that has failed in delivering the welfare of the community in the village (Susilo et al., 2021)

The route of change and innovation of policies in deliberative democracy must ensure that their form is based on efficiency and embodies local values and benefits. The strengthening of the Saibatin indigenous people forum as an informal representative institution that was established from community initiation grew from local historical traditions that became a valuable village wealth (McKeown et al., 2016). Traditional figures, village consultation (deliberations), and cooperation were traditions and social capital that strengthened institutional functions in guarding the community's aspirations to village policies. The institutional style and character of this informal representation were flexible, adaptive, and. They provided many (encouragement) to transcend the social barriers between the community and its leaders (Benham & Hussey, 2018). The institutional character had resulted in the widening of public space and had been successfully reached by almost all strata of society and increased in a community initiative, which in some cases was a new way and mechanism for negotiating interests to influence village policies (Lewanski, 2020). The presence of informal channels became an alternative consideration in overcoming the limitations of the formal institutional route.

The innovation of roadmap routes was through a combination of formal and informal representational styles as a compromise of the weaknesses of formal institutions in articulating and aggregating community interests. Blockages were through informal channels, which were considered more rooted and close to the inner atmosphere of the community. The use of new routes through new agencies or old figures who could articulate and act as an intermediary for community aspirations was another non-bureaucratic approach that was highly relevant to the procedural democracy system and the driving factor for village democracy. The leadership style that shifts towards being open, committed, and responsive has become an opportunity for political reform in formulating village public policies that are more pro to the community and can prosper the community (Kendi, 2017; Kusumastuti et al., 2020).

The plan for restoring and reviving local democracy through deliberative planning forums has become strategic. It contributes to institutionalizing the culture and procedures of deliberative democracy towards a democratic village. Community forums are required and function as a space for community expression in collective bounds based on regions, sectors, and professions and to maintain the character of deliberative democracy (Kondrashov, 2018). This route must be institutionalized by reviving the values that have been living in the village community. Democratic mechanisms and practices are established on people's experiences interacting and building relationships, not using democracy originates outside the tradition (Lenz, 2019; Renwick et al., 2018; Retno & Asra'I, 2018).

Therefore, four implications of roadmap route innovation can be considered: First, the innovation must be legitimate and politically sustainable, for example, by

being able to attract continuous support, authority, and funds from the competent authority (Andanda, 2019; Hurst et al., 2018; Toussaint, 2019); Second, public innovation refers to various democratic values that are considered necessary by the community. Innovation can lead to increased public access, participation and empowerment, transparency, accountability, and equality. Third, the outcome of innovation may also address problems encountered by the community and affect their daily lives. Fourth, the public value of innovation can also depend on its legal feasibility (Arvind, 2012; Lewanski, 2020).

Some efforts to revive and maintain these informal institutions require recognition through change and innovation in developing new forms and governance in processes and outcomes (Arvind, 2012; Leib & Elmendorf, 2012). The study of modern innovation theory demonstrates that innovation is not something that can be related to an individual's capacity and abilities. Still, the process requires the ability and willingness of actors/stakeholders to work together in practice, connect and share ideas, knowledge, and experiences outside the boundaries of traditional organizations, and exchange resources. A study (Castells, 2015) described innovation in the institutional conversion process, which can fundamentally transform new collaborative relationships and institutional arrangements in community-driven services. It refers to a relatively free and interactive exchange of knowledge, information, and experiences, in which new ideas and concepts are discussed within inter-organizational networks. The route is carried out by changing how actors/stakeholders relate, interact, and collaborate. Innovations act as game changers and breakthrough road dependencies. The capacity of community governance to manage demands and challenges can be improved as the game is being changed. As a result of this innovation process, community-driven services require new collaborative relationships and new institutional arrangements. Thus, the innovation concept emphasizes that the outcome is related to innovation driven by science and technology; on the contrary, it is essential to look beyond technological innovation.

Factors that affect the innovation environment include strong legal culture and policy aspects *that* suppress standardization and formalization practices. Standardization and formalization generate many regulations, usually translated into procedures, routines, and other systems and practices and taken for granted. Some new concepts, methods, technologies, and treatment processes are unlikely to be accepted. Organizations that work mechanically and are driven by regulations tend to prefer incremental innovation over transformative innovation. The dominance of the legal culture can be an obstacle to the willingness of the public sector to innovate. Therefore, a solid legal culture can act as a barrier to innovation. This legal culture also affects how civil servants generally think and act (Bijulal, 2018; He & Wagenaar, 2018; Ramsey, 2013).

Political and administrative environment aspects are the triggers for innovation. The environment such as globalization, individualism, fragmentation, computer, the political and administrative problems that arise can trigger innovation. Public administration issues can also be identified through the performance deficit, which is the gap between the actual performance of public organizations and the needs of society, including in terms of efficiency, the operational effectiveness of public organizations, and issues of organizational legitimacy. Besides, the multi-rationality of public administration, which results in competition between values that must be reconciled, has created tensions that can create a compromise process between those values, thus potentially creating innovation in the form of new combinations of problem-setting and problem-solving strategies (Bijulal, 2018; Clutton, 2018; Lee & Jin, 2014). An increase in political competition for the community's approval who have expectations and demands can improve the quality of public services. Combined with the desire to cut bureaucracy, it is increasingly becoming a political issue and an incentive for the public sector to innovate.

Government and civil servant tradition aspects. Particular state and governance traditions as the dominant public service culture can affect the formation and outcome of innovation. Innovation in the public sector depends on whether organizations can explore and implement new ideas to engage in trial and error. It reflects the government's capacity to encounter social and political challenges on the one hand and the capacity to organize itself to improve services for the community on the other hand. This governance capacity is primarily required to address social and political challenges. The dominance of a formal government regulatory approach often destroys local intelligence and practical knowledge, including local learning processes necessary to develop approaches adjusted to the community's needs. At the same time, these governance traditions may emphasize different values, knowledge, skills, and competencies than the more hierarchical and regulations-oriented traditions of governance (Bebbington et al., 2006; Kepramareni et al., 2020; Nas et al., 2019).

5 Conclusions

The study aimed to examine the innovation of the deliberative democracy to solve problems and increase government capacity. More specifically, this study analyzed innovation for village-level regional development planning roadmap, with the village democracy model as a pillar of locality and the mandate of the Village Law in South Lampung Regency, Indonesia. The authors identified several factors hindering the innovation environment. We obtained three main problems and challenges with innovation: village leadership behavior, formal village representative institutions, and community initiatives.

This study showed that the village deliberation was a tradition and daily value system in the village that had been rooted and had lived for a long time in Indonesia and implemented in three forms; manners, ethics, and the rule of law. The environment of innovation based on the rule of law is carried out by presenting and recognizing the traditions and values of the community. The institutionalization of local institutions (*Saibatin*), local actors as representative of elderly-articulating figures (traditional & community leaders), and features that promote local democracy in the village (community consultation, cooperation). Institutionalization can change the face of the bureaucratic village government in supporting the success of a village democratic system. An open, committed, and responsive leadership style strengthens the political opportunities for reform in formulating village public policies that are more pro to the community and prosper.

Innovation of the roadmap of planning deliberation forums is carried out in 2 ways, including establishing new collaborative relationships by sharing ideas, knowledge, and experiences outside the boundaries of traditional organizations and exchanging essential resources. Second, institutional conversion, in the form of new institutional arrangements through a combination of formal and informal representation styles, compromises formal institutional weaknesses in articulating and aggregating community interests. The non-bureaucratic approach is prioritized in new institutions because it is more rooted and closer to the inner atmosphere of the community as an intermediary for community aspirations. Therefore, innovation of the roadmap route acts as a game-changer (value) and breaks through road dependencies to achieve benefits for the community.

On a more strategic level, we recommend building an innovative environment. The government needs to manage change at three levels: first, changes to the main actors, including residents and village communities. Support for innovation will be achieved when the community has initiatives based on knowledge, skills, and commitment to developing deliberative democracy; second, changes in government. Support for innovation will be achieved when the government makes mechanical organizational changes with shackles of standardization and formality of regulations in routine procedures, changing traditions and hierarchical governance that has destroyed local intelligence by now; *third*, changes in the deliberation room. Support for innovation occurs when the deliberation room is expanded through recognition and strengthening of channels of informality by maintaining a flexible, adaptive institutional character, providing intimacy (encouragement) that surpasses social barriers between the community and its leaders. These are new ways and mechanisms for negotiating interests to influence village policies.

For the success of the innovation environment, support and acknowledgment of government policies are required to present local democracy activists who are

educated as innovation champions to organize citizens. If managed properly, they will bring back the flow of democracy. The local/village democracy roadmap can be a correction for liberal and representative democracy that has failed to deliver prosperity to village communities and increase government capacity.

Acknowledgment:

The author would like to thank and appreciate all parties who have facilitated the implementation of research, program support, and budget:

1. National Competitive Research Under the National Strategic Scheme sponsored by the Ministry of Education, Research and Technology of the Republic Indonesia (2015-2016)
2. National Competitive Research Under the Basic Research Scheme sponsored by the Ministry of Education, Research and Technology of the Republic Indonesia (2017-2018)

References:

- Adenskog, M. (2018) After the equilibrium: Democratic innovations and long-term institutional development in the City of Reykjavik, *Analyse Und Kritik*, 40(1), pp. 31–53.
- Airaksinen, J. & Albrecht, E. (2019) Arguments and their effects – A case study on drafting the legislation on the environmental impacts of peat extraction in Finland, *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 226, pp. 1004–1012.
- Andanda, P. (2019) Public engagement as a potential responsible research and innovation tool for ensuring inclusive governance of biotechnology innovation in low- and middle-income countries, In: von Schomberg, R. (ed.) *International Handbook on Responsible Innovation: A Global Resource* (America: Edward Elgar Publishing Ltd), pp. 113-202.
- Antlöv, H., Wetterberg, A. & Dharmawan, L. (2016) Village Governance, Community Life, and the 2014 Village Law in Indonesia, *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, 52(2), pp. 161–183.
- Arvind, G. R. (2012) Deliberative democracy, people's agency, and education: A case of dialogic transformation of a school system, In: Mitchell, R. C. & Moore, S. A. (eds.) *Politics, Participation & Power Relations: Transdisciplinary Approaches to Critical Citizenship in the Classroom and Community* (Netherlands: Sense Publishers), pp. 1-17.
- Baogang, H. (2012) Four models of the relationship between confucianism and democracy, In: Dallmayr, F. & Tingyang, Z. (eds.) *Contemporary Chinese Political Thought: Debates and Perspectives* (Kentucky: The University Press of Kentucky), pp. 131-151, available at: <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-84905310638 &partnerID=40 &md5=bc08c7556642b1d4e84861a5ae5ba849> (March 1, 2023).
- Bebbington, A., Dharmawan, L., Fahmi, E. & Guggenheim, S. (2006) Local Capacity, Village Governance, and the Political Economy of Rural Development in Indonesia, *World Development*, 34(11), pp. 1958–1976.
- Benham, C. F. & Hussey, K. E. (2018) Mainstreaming deliberative principles in Environmental Impact Assessment: current practice and future prospects in the Great Barrier Reef, Australia, *Environmental Science and Policy*, 89, pp. 176–183.

- Berenschot, W. (2018) Incumbent bureaucrats: Why elections undermine civil service reform in Indonesia, *Public Administration, and Development*, 38(4), pp. 135–143.
- Bijlul, M. V. (2018) Rights of the urban poor in Delhi and deliberative democracy: Understanding the aam aadmi party experience, In: Joseph, T. & Joseph, S. K. (eds.) *Deliberative Democracy: Understanding the Indian Experience* (London: Taylor and Francis), pp. 16-28.
- Bocatto, E. & Perez-De-Toledo, E. (2020) Knowledge acquisition and meaning-making in the participatory budgeting of local governments, *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, 18(2), pp. 149–160.
- Borov, A. H., Dzamihov, K. F. & Karamurzov, B. S. (2017) Sustainable development and politics: Fundamental issues in a regional perspective, *Sustainable Development of Mountain Territories*, 9(4), pp. 325–331.
- Carpini, M. X. D., Cook, F. L. & Jacobs, L. R. (2004) Public Deliberation, Discursive Participation, and Citizen Engagement: A Review of the Empirical Literature, *Annual Review of Political Science*, 7(1), pp. 315–344.
- Castells, M. (2015) *Networks of outrage and hope: social movements in the Internet age* (New Jersey: Polity), available at: <https://www.wiley.com/en-us/Networks+of+Outrage+and+Hope%3A+Social+Movements+in+the+Internet+Age%2C+2nd+Edition-p-9780745695761> (March 1, 2023).
- Chaskin, R., Khare, A. & Joseph, M. (2012) Participation, Deliberation, and Decision Making: The Dynamics of Inclusion and Exclusion in Mixed-Income Developments, *Urban Affairs Review*, 48(6), pp. 863–906.
- Clutton, C. (2018) Cultural competence for health policy development, *International Journal of Community Diversity*, 17(4), pp. 15-26.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014) *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative, and Mixed Methods Approaches* (4th ed.) (Singapore: SAGE Publications), <https://doi.org/10.1007/s13398-014-0173-7.2>.
- Croissant, A. & Lorenz, P. (2018) *Comparative politics of Southeast Asia: an introduction to governments and political regimes* (Berlin: Springer link).
- Djafar, T. B. M., Zamharir, H. & Syam, F. (2019) Participation deficit in local governance in contemporary Indonesia, *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity, and Change*, 9(1), pp. 303-320, available at: <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85080110751&partnerID=40&md5=f071bf9afe84478c7fee97a629cbe85> (March 2, 2023).
- Drew, J. (2019) Can a local government by lottery increase democratic responsiveness?, *Policy and Politics*, 47(4), pp. 621–636.
- Duadji, N. & Tresiana, N. (2016) Pemodelan dalam Forum Musrenbang Desa di Kabupaten Lampung Selatan dan Kabupaten Pesawaran Modelling Forum Musrenbang Desa in Lampung Selatan and Pesawaran Regency, *POLITIK: Jurnal Kajian Politik Dan Masalah Pembangunan*, 12(2), pp. 1829–1844.
- Duadji, N. & Tresiana, N. (2018) A participation model based on community forum as a reproductive health knowledge transaction space to increase male participation in vasectomy, *Masyarakat, Kebudayaan Dan Politik*, 31(1), p. 1.
- Filatova, O. & Volkovskii, D. (2020) The online discourse as a form of e-Participation: The experience of internet discourse research, In: Charalabidis, Y. & Cunha, M. A. (eds.) *ACM International Conference Proceeding Series* (Canada: Association for Computing Machinery), pp. 326–333.

- Fischer, F. (2010) Policy deliberation: Confronting subjectivity and emotional expression, *Critical Policy Studies*, 3(3–4), pp. 407–420.
- Fischer, F. & Gottweis, H. (2013) The argumentative turn in public policy revisited: Twenty years later, *Critical Policy Studies*, 7(4), pp. 425–433.
- Fritzen, S. A. (2007) Can the Design of Community-Driven Development Reduce the Risk of Elite Capture? Evidence from Indonesia, *World Development*, 35(8), pp. 1359–1375.
- García Agustín, Ó. (2012) Transnational deliberative democracy in the context of the European Union: The institutionalization of the European integration forum, *EIOP European Integration Online Papers*, 16.
- Gulakov, I. & Vanclay, F. (2019) Social impact assessment and stakeholder engagement in the Russian Federation: Representativeness, deliberativeness, and influence, *Environmental Impact Assessment Review*, 75, pp. 37–46.
- Hahn, A. (2018) Mongolia's 2015 Referendum via Text Messaging: Engaging Rural and Nomadic Citizens in Public Screen Deliberation, *International Journal of Communication*, 12, pp. 4379–4400.
- He, B. & Wagenaar, H. (2018) Authoritarian deliberation revisited, *Japanese Journal of Political Science*, 19(4), pp. 622–629.
- Holst, C. & Moe, H. (2021) Deliberative Systems Theory and Citizens' Use of Online Media: Testing a Critical Theory of Democracy on a High Achiever, *Political Studies*, 69(1), pp. 129–146.
- Hurst, S. A., Schindler, M., Goold, S. D. & Danis, M. (2018) Swiss-CHAT: Citizens discuss priorities for Swiss health insurance coverage, *International Journal of Health Policy and Management*, 7(8), pp. 746–754.
- Ionescu, D. P. & Eliantonio, M. (2021) Democratic Legitimacy and Soft Law in the EU Legal Order: A Theoretical Perspective, *Journal of Contemporary European Research*, 17(1), pp. 43–65.
- Jupesta, J., Supriyanto, A. A., Martin, G., Piliang, J., Yang, S., Purnomo, A., Neville, A. & Caliman, J.-P. (2020) Establishing multi-partnerships environmental governance in Indonesia: Case of desa makmur peduli api (prosperous and fire-free village) program, In: Squires, V. R. & Gaur, M. K. (eds.) *Food Security and Land Use Change under Conditions of Climatic Variability: A Multidimensional Perspective* (New York: Springer International Publishing), pp. 21–34.
- Karim, M. R. & Thiel, A. (2017) Role of a community-based local institution for climate change adaptation in the Teesta riverine area of Bangladesh, *Climate Risk Management*, 17, pp. 92–103.
- Kendi, I. K. (2017) Analysis of governance policy in cultural villages of sentani, Papua, Indonesia, *International Journal of Civil Engineering and Technology*, 8(9), pp. 852–866.
- Kepramareni, P., Yuliasuti, I. A. N. & Mariantini, N. L. M. (2020) Village accountability of village fund management in Gianyar Bali Indonesia, *Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical and Control Systems*, 12(1 Special Issue), pp. 849–855.
- Klintman, M. (2009) Participation in green consumer policies: Deliberative democracy under wrong conditions?, *Journal of Consumer Policy*, 32(1), pp. 43–57.
- Kondrashov, P. N. (2018) What ideology is necessary for Russia, and whether it is necessary? (About the book »Russia in search of ideologies: The transformation of value regulators of modern societies«), *Sotsiologicheskie Issledovaniya*, 2018-Janua(10), pp. 162–167.
- Kusumastuti (2017) The old phrase of Javanese villages as an early form of participatory democratic governance in Indonesia, *Journal of Regional and City Planning*, 28(3), pp. 219–236.

- Kusumastuti, H., Supriyono, B., Mindarti, L. I. & Wanto, A. H. (2020) The capacity and innovation of services in organizing village governance in Indonesia [La capacidad e innovación de los servicios en la organización de la gobernanza de las aldeas en Indonesia], *Opcion*, 36(Special Edition 26), pp. 1681–1696.
- Lalor, B. M. & Hickey, G. M. (2013) Environmental science and public policy in Executive government: Insights from Australia and Canada, *Science and Public Policy*, 40(6), pp. 767–778.
- Lee, Y. H. & Jin, D. Y. (2014) Technology and citizens: An analysis of citizens' jury on the Korean National Pandemic response system, *Javnost*, 21(3), pp. 23–38.
- Lehtonen, M. (2006) Deliberative Democracy, Participation, and OECD Peer Reviews of Environmental Policies, *American Journal of Evaluation*, 27(2), pp. 185–200.
- Lenzi, D. (2019) Deliberating about Climate Change: The Case for "Thinking and Nudging", *Moral Philosophy and Politics*, 6(2), pp. 313–336.
- Lewanski, R. (2020) Institutionalizing Deliberative Democracy: the 'Tuscany laboratory', *Journal of Deliberative Democracy*, 9(1).
- Lutpiah, M., Suryadi, S. & Faizi, F. (2017) Pemekaran desa dan Implikasinya Terhadap Kehidupan Masyarakat, *Empower: Jurnal Pengembangan Masyarakat Islam*.
- Ma, Z. (2017) An online forum of the third type: The case of Suzhou's Hanshan Wenzhong Forum, *Communication and the Public*, 2(1), pp. 67–83.
- Madyan, M., Prihantono, G. & Aisyah, R. A. (2020) Governance in a village fund program in East Java Indonesia, *International Journal of Innovation, Creativity and Change*, 11(11), pp. 344–365.
- Mannarini, T. & Fedi, A. (2018) Using Quali-Quantitative Indicators for Assessing the Quality of Citizen Participation: A Study on Three Citizen Juries, *Social Indicators Research*, 139(2), pp. 473–490.
- Mckeown, M., Jones, F., Wright, K., Spandler, H., Wright, J., Fletcher, H., Duxbury, J., Mccvittie, J., Simon & Turton, W. (2016) It's the talk: A study of involvement initiatives in secure mental health settings, *Health Expectations*, 19(3), pp. 570–579.
- Miles, M. B. & Huberman, A. M. (1994) *Qualitative data analysis: an expanded sourcebook* (New York: SAGE).
- Montpetit, É., Scala, F. & Fortier, I. (2004) The paradox of deliberative democracy: The National Action Committee on the Status of Women and Canada's policy on reproductive technology, *Policy Sciences*, 37(2), pp. 137–157.
- Nas, J., Nurlinah & Haryanto (2019) Indigenous village governance: Lessons from Indonesia, *Public Administration Issues*, 2019(6), pp. 94–104.
- Nurjaman, N. (2015) Dinamika dan Problematika Implementasi Undang-Undang Desa: Pembelajaran dari Tiga Daerah di Jawa Barat, *Jurnal Desentralisasi*, 13, pp. 47–60.
- Nurlinah & Haryanto (2020) Institutional mechanisms and civic forum in coastal village governance in Indonesia [Instituciniai svertai ir piliečių forumas Indonezijos pakrančių gyvenvietėse], *Public Policy and Administration*, 19(3), pp. 76–85.
- Nurlinah, Haryanto & Sunardi (2020) New development, olancientigration, and governance at two villages in Jeneponto, Indonesia, *World Development Perspectives*, 19.
- O'Malley, E., Farrell, D. M. & Suiter, J. (2020) Does talking matter? A quasi-experiment assessing the impact of deliberation and information on opinion change, *International Political Science Review*, 41(3), pp. 321–334.
- Pattiasina, V., Seralurin, Y. C., Kadubu, H. U., Hamadi, M. & Bonsafia, M. (2020) Implementation of village financial system applications in managing village fund: A study

- in Papua-Indonesia, *International Journal of Advanced Science and Technology*, 29(4 Special Issue), pp. 477–489.
- Qin, X. & He, B. (2021) The politics of authoritarian empowerment: Participatory pricing in China, *International Political Science Review*, 43(5), <https://doi.org/10.1177/0192512120985511>.
- Rachma, D. D., Somaji, R. P. & Kustono, A. S. (2019) Government expenditure, poverty and income inequality in Indonesia: New evidence from village funds, *International Journal of Scientific and Technology Research*, 8(8), pp. 38–42.
- Ramsey, P. (2013) The search for a civic commons online: An assessment of existing BBC Online policy, *Media, Culture and Society*, 35(7), pp. 864–879.
- Ravazzi, S. (2017) When a government attempts to institutionalize and regulate deliberative democracy: the how and why from a process-tracing perspective, *Critical Policy Studies*, 11(1), pp. 79–100.
- Reedy, J., Orr, R., Spicer, P., Blanchard, J. W., Hiratsuka, V. Y., Ketchum, T. S., Saunkeah, B., Wark, K. & Woodbury, R. B. (2020) Deliberative democracy and historical perspectives on American Indian/Alaska native political decision-making practices, *Humanities and Social Sciences Communications*, 7(1).
- Renwick, A., Allan, S., Jennings, W., Mckee, R., Russell, M. & Smith, G. (2018) What Kind of Brexit do Voters want? Lessons from the Citizens' Assembly on Brexit, *Political Quarterly*, 89(4), pp. 649–658.
- Retno, S. A. & Asra'I, M. (2018) Public Consultation: Collaboration of Government and Citizens in the Local Requirements-Based Policy Processing, In: Warsito, M. & Hadiyanto, B. (eds.) *E3S Web of Conferences*, 73 (France: EDP Sciences), pp. 1–4.
- Ritter, A., Lancaster, K. & Diprose, R. (2018) Improving drug policy: The potential of broader democratic participation, *International Journal of Drug Policy*, 55, pp. 1–7.
- Schafer, J. G. (2016) Making role-playing real, *Teaching Public Administration*, 34(2), pp. 150–158.
- Shortall, R. (2021) Deliberative appraisal methods, *Advances in Transport Policy and Planning*, 7, pp. 51–82.
- Siddiqui, T., Szaboova, L., Adger, W. N., de Campos, R., Bhuiyan, M. R. A. & Billah, T. (2021) Policy Opportunities and Constraints for Addressing Urban Precarity of Migrant Populations, *Global Policy*, 12(S2), pp. 91–105.
- Simon-Kumar, R. (2018) Inclusionary policy and marginalized groups in Aotearoa/New Zealand process, impacts, and politics, *Kotuitui*, 13(2), pp. 246–260.
- Sukmawati, F. (2019) The effect ability of village fund management apparatus, village government organizational commitments, and community participation on accountability for the management of village funds in sub-districts in Indonesia, *Journal of Advanced Research in Dynamical and Control Systems*, 11(7 Special Issue), pp. 653–659.
- Susilo, D., Hidayat, E. & Marta, R. F. (2021) Village public innovations during COVID19 pandemic in rural areas: Phenomena in Madura, Indonesia, *Cogent Social Sciences*, 7(1).
- Sutiyo, Maharjan, K. L., Sutiyo & Maharjan, K. L. (2017) Historical Background of Decentralization in Indonesia, In: Sutiyo & Maharjan, K. L. (eds.) *Decentralization and Rural Development in Indonesia* (Singapore: Springer Singapore), pp. 1–11.
- Toussaint, B. (2019) Transport history as policy lab for democratic governance, *Journal of Transport History*, 40(2), pp. 270–280.
- Tresiana, N. & Duadji, N. (2016a) Multi Stakeholders Governance Body Model In Achieving the Excellence Public Policy, *MIMBAR, Jurnal Sosial Dan Pembangunan*, 32(2), p. 401.

- Tresiana, N. & Duadji, N. (2016b) Kegagalan pemaknaan “Lembaga Musawarah Perencanaan dan Pembangunan Desa” dalam mewujudkan deepening democracy, *Masyarakat, Kebudayaan Dan Politik*, 29(4), p. 191.
- Vel, J. A. C. & Bedner, A. W. (2015) Decentralization and village governance in Indonesia: The return to the Nagari and the 2014 Village law, *Journal of Legal Pluralism and Unofficial Law*, 47(3), pp. 493–507.
- Verdiesen, I., Dignum, V. & Van Den Hoven, J. (2018) Measuring moral acceptability in E-deliberation: A practical application of ethics by participation, *ACM Transactions on Internet Technology*, 18(4).
- Vos, J., Perreault, T. & Boelens, R. (2018) Introduction: Exclusion and struggles for co-decision, In: Boelens, R., Perreault, T. & Vos, J. (eds.) *Water Justice* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press) pp. 71-82.
- Wu, Y., Wu, Y., Shang, Y., Guo, H. & Wang, J. (2020) Social network efficiency of multiple stakeholders on agricultural drought risk governance — A southern China case study, *International Journal of Disaster Risk Reduction*, 51, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijdrr.2020.101772>.
- Yin, R. K. (2018) *Case study research: Design and methods (2nd Edition)* (New York: SAGE Publications, Inc.).
- Young, H. (2017) Busy yet passive: (non-)decision-making in school governing bodies, *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 38(6), pp. 812–826.
- Zhang, K. (2019) Encountering Dissimilar Views in Deliberation: Political Knowledge, Attitude Strength, and Opinion Change, *Political Psychology*, 40(2), pp. 315–333.