

PARTICIPATORY DEVELOPMENT GOVERNANCE FROM A SOCIOLOGICAL PERSPECTIVE: FROM PLANNING TO EVALUATION

Ahmad Amri, Khomsahrial Romli, Mawardi, Sri Ilham Nasution

Raden Intan State Islamic University Lampung, Indonesia

Email: ahmad.amrizaki@gmail.com, khomsahrial@gmail.com,
m.mawardij@radenintan.ac.id, sriilhamnasution@radenintan.ac.id

Abstract

Keywords:

Participatory
 Development Governance,
 Community Participation,
 Sociological Perspective,
 Development Cycle,

Participatory development governance is increasingly important for ensuring that development processes respond to community needs and promote inclusive decision-making. However, previous studies have largely examined community participation at a single stage, particularly planning, while limited attention has been given to participation as a continuous process from planning to evaluation, including the sociological dimensions of power relations, social capital, communication, and collective capacity. This study aims to analyze participatory development governance from a sociological perspective across the stages of planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation and to identify the social factors influencing the quality and continuity of community participation. This study employed a qualitative literature review approach by analyzing relevant scientific articles published primarily between 2016 and 2026. Data were collected through documentation and analyzed using thematic identification, comparison, and synthesis of findings related to participatory governance, community participation, power relations, social capital, communication, and accountability. The findings indicate that community participation is generally strongest during the planning stage, particularly through formal forums such as Musrenbang, but tends to decline during implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. The quality of participation is influenced by power relations, access to information, communication, social capital, inclusivity, and the capacity of communities to influence decisions. The study concludes that participatory development governance should be understood as a continuous social cycle rather than a procedural planning mechanism, requiring meaningful community influence throughout the development process.

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



INTRODUCTION

Development is fundamentally a process involving transformations in the social life of communities. The success of development should not be assessed solely in terms of infrastructure provision or economic achievements, but also by its capacity to respond to community needs and generate equitable benefits (Ariyanti et al., 2025). This paradigm shift in development has subsequently encouraged greater community involvement in determining development priorities, as local communities possess valuable knowledge of their own conditions and needs. Public participation in this process may take various forms, ranging from the provision of information and consultation to direct involvement in decision-making (Mahllella, 2025).

In Indonesia, community involvement in development is facilitated, among other mechanisms, through the Development Planning Deliberation (Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan or Musrenbang) and Village Development Planning Deliberation (Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan Desa or Musrenbangdes). These forums provide spaces for expressing community aspirations, identifying local needs, and determining development priorities. However, the existence of participatory mechanisms does not necessarily indicate that communities exercise substantial influence over final decisions (Enala et al., 2025). Syifana et al. (2026) found that formal participation through Musrenbangdes tends to remain limited to certain groups, whereas informal forums may provide broader spaces for deliberation (Syifana et al., 2026).

This situation reveals a distinction between procedural and substantive participation. Communities may attend development forums, submit proposals, and participate in deliberative meetings without necessarily possessing sufficient capacity to influence agendas and decisions (Zahir et al., 2026). Ali and Ridwan (2025) demonstrate that community involvement in village development continues to face challenges related to the dominance of particular groups, limited transparency, and inadequate oversight. These conditions indicate that the quality of participation is closely associated with the distribution of information and the extent to which community members have opportunities to access decision-making processes (Ali & Ridwan, 2025).

Furthermore, challenges related to participation do not arise solely when development priorities are determined. Community involvement should be sustained throughout the entire development cycle, encompassing planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation (Ginting et al., 2024). However, Widiyahseno et al. (2025) identified a *participation gap*, whereby community involvement tends to be stronger during the planning stage but declines during implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. This finding indicates that participatory development continues to face challenges in sustaining meaningful community engagement throughout the development cycle (Widiyahseno et al., 2025).

From a sociological perspective, this condition cannot be understood merely as a matter of technical or administrative development management. Participation constitutes a social process shaped by power relations, communication, social networks, trust, norms, and the interests of different actors. Communities occupy different social positions and possess unequal resources; consequently, their capacity to articulate aspirations and influence decisions is not necessarily equal (Fauzi, 2026). Kurnia and Miradhia (2024) demonstrate that community-based development can be strengthened through decentralization, democratization, and collective action, which enable communities to participate in development planning, implementation, and oversight (Kurnia & Miradhia,

2024).

The concept of participatory governance is therefore relevant for examining the extent to which communities are provided with meaningful space in decision-making processes. From this perspective, participation extends beyond consultation and concerns the capacity of communities to articulate their interests, negotiate with other actors, and exert influence over decisions (Jamaluddin et al., 2025). Pratiwi et al. (2026) found that although communities have been involved in Musrenbangdes, the processes of agenda setting and priority determination remain relatively dominated by village governments. This finding demonstrates that the existence of participatory forums does not automatically produce an equitable distribution of power between government and community actor (D. A. Pratiwi et al., 2025).

Previous studies have examined community participation in village planning, *Musrenbang*, *good governance*, and *community-driven development*. However, much of this literature remains focused on a single development stage or mechanism, particularly the planning stage. Research that examines community participation comprehensively from planning through evaluation while incorporating dimensions of power relations, social capital, social interaction, and collective action remains limited and warrants further development. Accordingly, a *research gap* remains in understanding participatory development governance as a continuous social process that unfolds throughout the development cycle (Abas et al., 2023).

Previous studies have examined community participation in village planning, *Musrenbang*, *good governance*, and *community-driven development*. However, much of this literature remains focused on a single development stage or mechanism, particularly the planning stage. Research that examines community participation comprehensively from planning through evaluation while incorporating dimensions of power relations, social capital, social interaction, and collective action remains limited and warrants further development. Accordingly, a research gap remains in understanding participatory development governance as a continuous social process that unfolds throughout the development cycle (Abas et al., 2023).

Addressing this gap, the present study advances a perspective that conceptualizes This inquiry is important because substantively participatory development can enhance the alignment of development programs with community needs while strengthening transparency, accountability, and the legitimacy of development decisions. Conversely, participation that remains merely formal may perpetuate discrepancies between community aspirations and government decisions. Therefore, understanding the dynamics of participation throughout the development cycle is essential for promoting governance that is more inclusive and responsive to community needs (Syifana et al., 2026).

Based on the foregoing discussion, the study entitled “Participatory Development Governance from a Sociological Perspective: From Planning to Evaluation” aims to analyze the processes of participatory development governance across the stages of planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation, while identifying the social factors that influence the quality of community engagement. The study is expected to contribute to the development of scholarship in the sociology of development while strengthening the understanding of the importance of communities as active actors throughout the entire development process.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Development Governance

Development governance refers to the process of managing development through relationships and coordination among government, communities, and various non-governmental actors in determining the direction and implementation of development. This concept has evolved from state-centered approaches to governance models that are more collaborative and involve multiple stakeholders. In the context of village development, governance is concerned not only with the government's capacity to implement development programs but also with the extent to which communities have access to decision-making processes, information, and oversight mechanisms. Syukri (2024) demonstrates that the institutionalization of participatory governance at the village level has not always been able to address poverty and marginalization, as its implementation may still be influenced by centralized approaches. This finding indicates that the quality of governance is largely determined by the relationship between governmental structures and communities' capacity to influence development processes (Syukri, 2024).

Accordingly, development governance in this study is understood as a process of regulating and managing development that involves government, communities, and relevant actors through mechanisms of participation, coordination, transparency, accountability, and collective decision-making. This understanding is important because development does not take place solely within an administrative domain; rather, it constitutes a process shaped by social relations and the distribution of resources among development actors.

Participatory Development

Participatory development positions communities as active subjects with opportunities to engage in development processes. Participation may encompass articulating needs, determining priorities, implementing activities, exercising oversight, and evaluating development outcomes. Through a systematic review of public participation, Abas et al. (2023) demonstrate that community involvement in planning may occur through information provision, consultation, and active participation in decision-making. Thus, participation encompasses different levels of engagement, and not every form of involvement can be regarded as substantive participation (Abas et al., 2023).

In the Indonesian context, Nadhiro and Choiriyah (2024) demonstrate that community participation in village development planning takes place through several stages, including team formation, hamlet-level deliberations, Musrenbang, the formulation of plans, and the ratification of village development planning documents ((Nadhiro & Choiriyah, 2024). These findings indicate that participation can be incorporated into formal planning processes. Nevertheless, the existence of such mechanisms should still be assessed in terms of the extent to which communities are able to influence development decisions (De Nisa, 2024).

Based on this body of literature, participatory development in this study is understood as a development process that provides communities with opportunities to actively participate in identifying needs, formulating decisions, implementing programs, monitoring development activities, and evaluating development outcomes.

Community Participation from a Sociological Perspective

From a sociological perspective, community participation is understood not merely as individual involvement in an activity but as a social process involving interaction, communication, interests, norms, networks, and power relations. Communities occupy different social positions and possess unequal resources; consequently, the capacity of different groups to participate is not necessarily equal (Amalia et al., 2026).

This perspective is important because development forums may generate different forms of participation. Syifana et al. (2026), for instance, found that formal participation through Musrenbangdes tends to be dominated by particular representatives, whereas informal forums such as rembug warga provide more open and deliberative spaces. This finding demonstrates that participation is strongly influenced by social structures and the communication mechanisms available to communities (Syifana et al., 2026).

Furthermore, Fitriyah and Pratiwi (2026) found that communication hierarchies and power relations within Musrenbangdes may constrain dialogue and the functioning of the public sphere. Differences in status, roles, and access among participants may affect communities' ability to articulate their aspirations. Therefore, this study conceptualizes participation as a social phenomenon that cannot be separated from power relations, social status, communication, and access to development resources (A. Pratiwi, 2026).

Participatory Governance

The concept of participatory governance constitutes one of the principal foundations for understanding participatory development governance. It emphasizes community involvement in public decision-making processes and does not limit communities to the role of policy recipients. In the context of village governance, participatory governance may be realized through deliberative forums, public consultations, community-group involvement, and mechanisms for monitoring and evaluation (Widnyani, 2025).

Pratiwi et al. (2026) demonstrate that the existence of Musrenbangdes does not automatically result in an equitable distribution of power. Although communities are involved in submitting proposals, the processes of agenda setting, proposal evaluation, and priority determination remain relatively dominated by village governments. Based on Arnstein's Ladder of Participation, this condition indicates that participation remains largely at the level of consultation and has not fully developed into partnership in decision-making (A. Pratiwi, 2026).

Accordingly, *participatory governance* is employed in this study to examine the extent to which communities are provided with space, voice, and influence in development decision-making processes.

Power Relations in Participatory Development

Power relations constitute a crucial dimension from a sociological perspective. Participation does not always occur on an equal footing because governments and communities possess different resources, authorities, information, and institutional positions. Consequently, participatory forums may function simultaneously as spaces for negotiating interests and as arenas in which power relations are reproduced (Nasyirudin, 2025).

Arnstein's Ladder of Citizen Participation explains that participation occurs at different levels, ranging from manipulation and therapy, through informing and consultation, to partnership, delegated power, and citizen control. Although this

framework is a classical theoretical formulation, it remains relevant for analyzing the quality of contemporary participation. Pratiwi et al. (2026) employ this framework to demonstrate that community participation in Musrenbangdes remains predominantly consultative.

In this study, the concept of power relations is used to analyze who determines the agenda, who has access to information, who influences decisions, and the extent to which development authority is shared with communities.

Social Capital in Development

In addition to power, social capital is an important dimension for explaining the success of participatory development. Social capital encompasses trust, norms, networks, reciprocity, and communities' capacity to cooperate. The presence of social capital can facilitate communication, build trust among actors, and encourage collective action. In community-based development, social capital can serve as a resource that enables communities to organize their interests, cooperate, and address problems collectively. Kurnia and Miradhia (2024) demonstrate that the community-driven development approach places communities at the center of development planning, implementation, and oversight through decentralization, democratization, and collective action (Kurnia & Miradhia, 2024).

In this study, social capital is used to examine how trust, social networks, norms, and community cooperation support or constrain participatory development processes.

Participatory Development Planning

Planning constitutes the initial stage that determines the direction and priorities of development. A participatory approach requires community needs to be incorporated into policy and program formulation. Development deliberation forums represent one mechanism through which communities can directly or indirectly, through their representatives, articulate their aspirations (Darin et al., 2022).

Ahmad et al. (2024) demonstrate that the Musrenbang process constitutes part of the development planning mechanism through which communities can articulate their needs and proposals. Meanwhile, Nadhiro and Choiriyah (2024) demonstrate that community participation in village planning occurs through several formal stages involving various local actors.

However, participatory planning faces challenges, including low community attendance, limited understanding, and suboptimal deliberative mechanisms. Briansyah and Umar (2024) found that low levels of participation and limited knowledge among decision-makers constitute one of the constraints on the effective use of village deliberation mechanisms (Muchammad, 2024).

Participatory Development Implementation

Community participation should not end at the planning stage. During implementation, communities may act as activity implementers, beneficiaries, monitors, or government partners. Community involvement at this stage is important to ensure that planned development initiatives are genuinely aligned with local needs (Sumardi Efendi et al., 2025). The community-driven development approach emphasizes communities' capacity to organize and implement development activities collectively. Kurnia and Miradhia (2024) demonstrate that community involvement may encompass planning,

implementation, and oversight, thereby ensuring that communities are not merely recipients of development outcomes.

From this perspective, development implementation in this study is understood as the stage at which development decisions are translated into action through collaboration among government, communities, and other relevant actors, drawing upon available social and institutional resources.

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

Monitoring and evaluation constitute essential stages for assessing the consistency between development planning, implementation, and outcomes. Within a participatory approach, communities are not merely objects receiving evaluation results; they may also contribute by assessing development processes, sharing their experiences, identifying problems, and providing recommendations for improvement (Bilqis et al., 2023). Nevertheless, participation at this stage remains relatively weak. Widiyahseno et al. (2025) found that community involvement tends to decline after the planning stage and becomes increasingly limited during monitoring and evaluation. Indeed, these two stages often lack participatory spaces as robust as those available during the planning process (Widiyahseno et al., 2025).

These findings underscore the importance of extending the concept of participation beyond *planning participation* toward participation throughout the development cycle, ensuring that communities continue to have opportunities to provide feedback on development implementation and outcomes.

RESEARCH METHODS

Research Design

This study employs a qualitative approach using a literature review design. The study aims to analyze participatory development governance from a sociological perspective across the stages of planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. The analysis is conducted by identifying, comparing, and synthesizing findings from previous studies addressing community participation, development governance, power relations, social capital, communication, and the sustainability of community participation throughout the development process.

Research Object and Data Sources

The object of this study is participatory development governance throughout the development cycle, encompassing planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. The data sources consist of scholarly journal articles relevant to the research topic. The literature is selected based on its relevance to the research focus, the credibility of the publisher, the clarity of the authorship and publication year, and the recency of the sources. Priority is given to scholarly publications published between 2016 and 2026, with particular emphasis on empirical studies addressing participatory development and development governance at the local level.

Data Collection Technique

Data are collected through documentary techniques by conducting a literature search across relevant academic databases and journal websites. The keywords used include *participatory development*, *participatory governance*, *community participation*, *development planning*, *development implementation*, *participatory monitoring and evaluation*, *social capital*, and *power relations*. The identified literature is subsequently

screened based on the relevance of its title, abstract, research focus, methodology, and contribution to the discussion of participatory development governance.

Research Instrument

The primary instrument in this study is the researcher, supported by a data extraction sheet. The extraction sheet is used to record publication details, research objectives, research locations or contexts, methodological approaches, forms of community participation, development stages examined, supporting and inhibiting factors, and the principal findings of each study. Reference management is conducted using Mendeley to facilitate the organization of sources and the preparation of citations.

Data Analysis Technique

The data are analyzed qualitatively through several stages. First, the collected literature is screened based on its relevance and source quality. Second, key information from each article is extracted and categorized according to the research themes, namely planning, implementation, monitoring, evaluation, power relations, social capital, communication, and accountability. Third, findings from different sources are compared to identify similarities, differences, patterns, and factors influencing the quality of community participation. Fourth, these findings are synthesized to develop an understanding of participatory development governance from a sociological perspective. The final stage involves integrating the findings to identify patterns of relationships among community participation, social structures, power relations, social capital, and the effectiveness of development governance (Haramain, 2026).

Operational Definition and Analytical Focus

In this study, participatory development governance is operationally defined as a development management process that provides opportunities for community involvement in decision-making and development implementation on a sustained basis. The analytical focus is divided into four dimensions: (1) participation in planning, (2) participation in implementation, (3) involvement in monitoring, and (4) involvement in evaluation. The analysis also considers sociological dimensions, including the distribution of power, the quality of communication, social capital, inclusiveness, the representation of community groups, and communities' capacity to influence development decisions.

Analytical Asoects

Because this study employs a qualitative approach, the term “measurement variables” refers to analytical aspects rather than statistical variables. The principal aspects examined include the quality of community participation, power distribution, social capital, communication and deliberation, inclusiveness, transparency, accountability, and the continuity of participation. These aspects are examined at each stage of the development process to determine whether community participation is substantive or merely a formality of administrative procedures (Widnyani, 2025).

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Research Results

Mapping the Literature on Participatory Development Governance

The literature research indicates that participatory development governance in Indonesia has evolved through various mechanisms of community engagement, particularly in village- and local-level development planning. However, the synthesis reveals that the intensity of participation varies across different stages of the development

process. Through a library research approach examining studies conducted in Indonesia during the 2021–2025 period, Widiyahseno et al. (2025) found that community participation is strongest during the planning stage, particularly through Musrenbang, but tends to weaken during implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. This condition indicates the existence of a participation gap throughout the development cycle.

This finding is further supported by Syifana et al. (2026), who demonstrate that community participation in village development takes place through two primary arenas: formal mechanisms in the form of Musrenbangdes and informal mechanisms in the form of rembug warga. Informal forums tend to be more open, inclusive, and deliberative, whereas formal forums tend to be dominated by particular representatives, thereby limiting the extent to which communities can influence decisions.

Based on this mapping, participatory development governance can be categorized into four main stages: planning, implementation, monitoring, and evaluation. These stages do not operate independently; rather, they constitute an interconnected cycle that should ideally provide opportunities for sustained community involvement.

Community Participation in Development Planning

The literature indicates that planning is the stage that provides the greatest number of formal opportunities for community participation. Musrenbang serves as one of the primary instruments for bringing government and communities together to identify needs and determine development priorities. Syifana et al. (2026) demonstrate that Musrenbangdes functions as a formal channel through which communities can articulate their aspirations in village development planning. However, participation through this formal mechanism has not fully translated into substantive influence over development decisions.

This finding demonstrates that the existence of participatory forums does not necessarily correspond to a high quality of participation. Communities may attend forums, submit proposals, and participate in deliberative processes, while final decisions may nevertheless remain influenced by actors possessing greater authority. Thus, the findings reveal a distinction between procedural participation and substantive participation.

Akbar et al. (2020), in their study of participatory planning practices in rural areas of Indonesia, likewise position community participation as an important component of achieving sustainable development. Their study demonstrates that planning practices should be assessed not merely based on the existence of participatory mechanisms but also in terms of the extent to which these processes contribute to broader development objectives. The article was published in *Community Development* and can be accessed through the available DOI.

Community Participation in Development Implementation

In contrast to the planning stage, community involvement during development implementation tends to be more limited. The synthesis of the literature indicates that communities are more frequently positioned as beneficiaries or as parties assisting in the implementation of activities rather than as actors actively involved in implementation-related decision-making. Widiyahseno et al. (2025) found that the intensity of participation declines after the planning process has been completed. This finding indicates that communities do not always have adequate opportunities to sustain their

involvement once development enters the implementation stage.

This condition is particularly important because implementation is the stage at which planning decisions are translated into concrete programs and activities. When communities are no longer actively involved, there is a risk of a disconnect between plans developed through participatory forums and the implementation of programs at the local level.

Participatory Monitoring and Evaluation

The literature indicates that monitoring and evaluation represent the weakest stages in terms of sustaining community participation. Widiyahseno et al. (2025) demonstrate that participation declines substantially during monitoring and evaluation because these stages do not yet provide participatory spaces as strong as those available during the planning process. This condition suggests that participation continues to be understood primarily as a mechanism for gathering community aspirations at the beginning of the development process rather than as a mechanism for oversight and learning throughout the development cycle. In fact, community involvement in monitoring can provide social oversight of program implementation, while evaluation can be used to assess the extent to which development outcomes correspond to community needs.

Power Relations in Participatory Development

The literature demonstrates that the quality of participation is closely associated with the distribution of power between government and communities. Syukri (2024) found that the institutionalization of participatory governance in Indonesia has not fully addressed the challenges faced by poor and marginalized groups. A predominantly centralized governmental structure may constrain the transformative potential of participatory institutions. Similarly, Syifana et al. (2026) demonstrate that formal participation mechanisms may be dominated by particular representatives and village government agendas. Limited community access to planning and financial information further reduces their capacity to participate critically in development processes.

Thus, the findings indicate that the central issue is not merely the low level of community attendance at development forums but, more fundamentally, the unequal capacity of different actors to influence decision-making processes.

Social Capital and Community Participation

The synthesis of the literature indicates that social capital constitutes one of the factors supporting sustained community participation. Social relationships, trust, communication, networks, and the capacity to cooperate can create conditions that enable communities to articulate their interests collectively. The findings of Syifana et al. (2026) demonstrate that rembug warga is more open and deliberative than certain formal participation mechanisms. Such forums enable community members to engage in dialogue, identify shared concerns, and develop collective solutions.

Accordingly, informal social spaces can function as mechanisms for strengthening formal participation. Community participation is shaped not only by institutional structures but also by the social relationships that develop among community members.

Synthesis of Research Findings

Based on the literature as a whole, three major patterns can be identified. First, participation is strongest during the planning stage, particularly through Musrenbang. Second, participation weakens during implementation, monitoring, and evaluation, resulting in a participation gap throughout the development cycle. Third, the quality of participation is influenced by power relations, access to information, communication, and social capital. Therefore, participatory development governance cannot be adequately assessed solely on the basis of the existence of participatory forums or the number of community members attending them. The quality of participation should instead be assessed in terms of communities' capacity to articulate their aspirations, influence decisions, participate in implementation, exercise oversight, and evaluate development outcomes.

Discussion

Participatory Development Governance from a Sociological Perspective

The findings demonstrate that participatory development constitutes a social process involving interactions among government, communities, and various interest groups. A sociological perspective helps explain that participation does not take place within a socially neutral space. Each actor occupies a different position and possesses varying levels of resources, interests, and power. Therefore, the existence of participatory forums cannot be used as the sole indicator of successful development governance. Syifana et al. (2026) demonstrate that formal forums may still result in limited engagement when community members function merely as representatives and lack adequate access to information and sufficient influence over decision-making processes.

In this context, participatory governance needs to move beyond mere inclusion toward influence. This means that communities should not merely be given opportunities to attend meetings and express their opinions but should also be provided with meaningful opportunities to influence development decisions.

Planning as an Arena of Social Interaction

Development planning constitutes an important arena for fostering interaction between communities and government. Musrenbang essentially provides a space for bringing community needs into dialogue with government agendas. However, the findings indicate that this process continues to face challenges when community aspirations are not fully translated into development priorities. Widiyahseno et al. (2025) found that participation is relatively strong during the planning stage but weakens during subsequent stages, indicating that participation is still largely treated as a process concentrated at the beginning of the development cycle.

From a sociological perspective, this condition demonstrates that planning constitutes an arena for negotiating interests. Communities bring their needs and lived social experiences, whereas government actors bring institutional authority, resources, and policy agendas. The quality of governance is therefore largely determined by the ability of both parties to establish open communication and develop inclusive decision-making mechanisms.

Power Relations and Substantive Participation

Power relations constitute one of the key findings of this study. Syukri (2024) demonstrates that the institutionalization of participatory governance does not automatically result in the empowerment of poor and marginalized groups. Structures that retain centralized characteristics may constrain the capacity of participatory institutions to generate more substantive forms of change. This finding indicates that participation needs to be examined through sociological questions: who has access, who determines the agenda, whose voices are heard, and who has the authority to make decisions

When communities are involved merely to submit proposals, while the agenda, priorities, and final decisions remain controlled by governmental elites, participation tends to remain consultative in nature. By contrast, substantive participation occurs when communities have genuine opportunities to influence decisions and oversee their implementation.

Formal and Informal Forums as Spaces for Participation

One important finding emerging from the recent literature is the distinction between formal and informal participation mechanisms. Syifana et al. (2026) demonstrate that rembug warga can provide a more open and inclusive space for deliberation than certain formal forums. This finding is particularly significant from a sociological perspective because communities do not interact solely through formal institutions. Social relationships, trust, networks, and everyday communication also shape communities' capacity to articulate their interests.

Accordingly, development governance should not position formal and informal forums in opposition to one another. Rather, the two can be integrated. Informal forums can serve as spaces for articulating community needs, while formal forums can function as institutional mechanisms for translating those aspirations into development policies and decisions.

Participation as a Cycle from Planning to Evaluation

The central finding of this study is that participation needs to be understood as a cycle, rather than as an activity that ends once planning has been completed. The findings of Widiyahseno et al. (2025) demonstrate the existence of a participation gap, as communities tend to be more actively involved in planning than in monitoring and evaluation. From the perspective of the sociology of development, each stage of the development process performs a distinct social function. Planning serves as a space for articulating needs, implementation as a space for collective action, monitoring as a mechanism of social oversight, and evaluation as a space for collective reflection and learning.

Accordingly, the success of participatory governance can be conceptualized through the following relationship:



Figure 1. Participatory Governance

This cycle demonstrates that evaluation findings should feed back into subsequent planning processes. Through such a mechanism, communities are not merely recipients

of development programs but become actors who remain continuously engaged in processes of social change.

Social Capital as a Linkage across Development Stages

Social capital can serve as a mechanism for sustaining continuity in community participation. Trust, social networks, norms of reciprocity, and collective capacity can facilitate coordination among community members across different stages of the development process. Findings concerning rembug warga indicate that more open spaces for social interaction can strengthen communication and collective problem-solving. However, social capital cannot operate independently. Public trust in government is difficult to sustain when communities lack access to information or do not observe meaningful follow-up to the aspirations they have expressed.

Therefore, social capital needs to be supported by transparency, access to information, accountability, and effective feedback mechanisms. The combination of these elements can foster more constructive relationships between communities and government.

CONCLUSION

The literature research findings indicate that participatory development governance needs to be implemented continuously throughout the development cycle, from planning and implementation to monitoring and evaluation. Community participation tends to be stronger during the planning stage but weakens during subsequent stages. From a sociological perspective, the quality of participation is influenced by power relations, access to information, communication, social capital, and inclusiveness. Therefore, participation needs to move beyond mere attendance at participatory forums toward meaningful involvement that enables communities to influence development decisions. Governments need to strengthen participation mechanisms across all stages of the development process, enhance transparency and access to information, and provide monitoring and evaluation spaces that actively involve communities.

This study is based on a literature research approach and therefore does not employ primary data; its findings are consequently dependent on the availability and characteristics of previous studies. Differences in social and institutional contexts across regions also limit the generalizability of the findings. Future research is recommended to employ empirical data through qualitative, quantitative, or mixed-methods approaches and to conduct comparative studies across multiple regions to examine the relationships among community participation, power relations, social capital, and the quality of development governance.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abas, A., Arifin, K., Ali, M. A. M., & Khairil, M. (2023). A Systematic Literature Review On Public Participation In Decision-Making For Local Authority Planning: A Decade Of Progress And Challenges. *Environmental Development*, 46, 100853.
- Ali, C., & Ridwan, M. (2025). Mengurai Kesenjangan Partisipasi: Transparansi Dan Dominasi Kelompok Tertentu Dalam Perencanaan Pembangunan Desa Padang Brahrang. *Jurnal Intervensi Sosial Dan Pembangunan (Jisp)*, 6(1), 65–74.
- Amalia, M., Judijanto, L., & Sepriano, S. (2026). *Sosiologi Pedesaan: Teori Dan*

- Perkembangan Pedesaan Di Indonesia*. Pt. Sonpedia Publishing Indonesia.
- Ariyanti, K. S., Prasetyo, B., Helminasari, S., & Abigayl, I. (2025). *Teori Pemberdayaan Dan Pembangunan Masyarakat*. Pradina Pustaka.
- Bilqis, M., Larassati, M. D., Mutiarani, R. A., Addinni, T., Heidiyanti, V. T., & Fitri, W. F. (2023). Peran Serta Masyarakat Dalam Perencanaan, Pelaksanaan, Pemantauan, Dan Penilaian Program Kesehatan Di Indonesia. *Jurnal Kesehatan Tambusai*, 3(4).
- Darin, D., Moonti, U., & Dai, S. I. S. (2022). Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pelaksanaan Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan (Musrembang) Desa. *Oikos Nomos: Jurnal Kajian Ekonomi Dan Bisnis*, 15(1), 11–21.
- De Nisa, G. (2024). Community Participation In Village Development Planning: A Comparative Study In Bakambat And Cindai Alus Villages. *Journal Of Transformative Governance And Social Justice*, 2(1), 25–41.
- Enala, S. H., Mana, F. A., Prasetya, M. N., & Adam, A. F. (2025). Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Adat Dalam Pengambilan Keputusan Pembangunan Lokal Di Kabupaten. *Jurnal Pengabdian Dan Inovasi*, 2(01), 8–17.
- Fauzi, S. (2026). *Sosiologi Pembangunan: Teori Dan Konsep*. Penerbit Kbm Indonesia.
- Ginting, G., Kuswandi, A., & Budiati, A. (2024). Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Perencanaan Pembangunan Desa Kandui: Faktor Pengaruh Dan Tantangan. *Neorespublica: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan*, 6(1), 112–129.
- Haramain, M. (2026). *Metodologi Penelitian Kepustakaan (Literature Review)*.
- Jamaluddin, Y., Nizhamul, N., & Pasha, S. (2025). *Birokrasi Dan Governansi Publik*. Cv Eureka Media Aksara.
- Kurnia, D. A., & Miradhia, D. (2024). Community Driven Development Model Pada Program Gerbang Cahayaku Di Desa Tanjungsari Kecamatan Karangpawitan Kabupaten Garut. *Majalah Ilmiah Unikom*, 22(1), 35–45.
- Mahlella, N. (2025). Strategi Penguatan Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pembangunan Daerah Berkelanjutan. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik*, 1(1), 27–34.
- Muchammad, P. B. (2024). Challenges In Community Participation For Village Governance Planning Tantangan Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Perencanaan Tata Kelola Pemerintahan Desa. *Indonesian Journal Of Cultural And Community Development*, 15(3).
- Nadhiro, R. A., & Choiriyah, I. U. (2024). Community Participation In Village Development Planning: Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Perencanaan Pembangunan Desa. *Indonesian Journal Of Public Policy Review*, 25(1), 10–21070.
- Nasyirudin, M. (2025). *Sosiologi Pemerintahan*. Cv Eureka Media Aksara.
- Pratiwi, A. (2026). Hirarki Komunikasi, Relasi Kuasa Dan Inkoherensi Peran Ruang Publik Pada Forum Pembangunan “Musrenbangdes.” *Jrk (Jurnal Riset Komunikasi)*, 17(1).
- Pratiwi, D. A., Nida, V. S., Saputra, D., & Adzikra, T. B. M. R. (2025). Participation And Power Distribution In Musrenbangdes: Analysis Of Village Governance. *Jurnal El-Riyasah*, 17(1), 16–37.
- Sumardi Efendi, S. H. I., Ramli, M. A., Benni Erick, S. H. I., Dar Kasih, M. S., Fitria Akmal, S., Jamiati, K. N., Mi, K., & Yuli Santri Isma, S. (2025). *Metodologi Pengabdian Masyarakat*. Pena Cendekia Pustaka.
- Syifana, A., Halim, A., & Lestari, S. F. (2026). Formal Vs Informal: Public Participation In Village Government Development Planning In Indonesia—Evidence From Bumiwangi Village. *Journal Of Accounting And Investment*, 27(1), 130–146.

- Syukri, M. (2024). Neglecting The Poor And Marginalized: Participatory Village Governance In Indonesia's New Developmentalist State. *Development Policy Review*, 42(4), E12776.
- Widiyahseno, B., Saputro, A. N. D., & Rachmawati, A. (2025). The Participation Gap In Indonesian Regional Development And Democracy. *Joels: Journal Of Election And Leadership*, 6(2), 184–194.
- Widnyani, I. A. P. S. (2025). *Transformasi Perencanaan Pembangunan Melalui Mekanisme Musyawarah Desa*. Deepublish.
- Zahir, A. A., Uma, C. M., Anabel, C., Ruzdy, N. N., Ridwan, R., & Pertiwi, G. (2026). Dinamika Self-Censorship Dalam Musrenbang: Analisis Faktor Dan Dampaknya Terhadap Representasi Aspirasi Masyarakat Di Kota Surabaya. *Aladalah: Jurnal Politik, Sosial, Hukum Dan Humaniora*.

