

BARRIERS TO DEVELOPMENT PLANNING AND IMPLEMENTATION: A DEVELOPMENT SOCIOLOGY PERSPECTIVE

Sri Utami, Khomsahrial Romli,
 M. Mawardi. J, Sri Ilham Nasution

Raden Intan State Islamic University of Lampung, Indonesia

Email: sriutamy2408@gmail.com, khomsahrial@gmail.com,
m.mawardij@radenintan.ac.id, sriilhamnasution@radenintan.ac.id

Abstract

Keywords:

Development Planning,
 Development Implementation,
 Community Participation,
 Development Sociology,
 Institutional Governance.

Development planning and implementation are essential processes for improving community welfare, yet both continue to face social, political, and institutional barriers. Previous studies have examined these challenges in specific local contexts; however, an integrated analysis connecting barriers across both stages from a development sociology perspective remains necessary. This study aims to identify the barriers to development planning and implementation, examine their underlying social, structural, and institutional factors, and explain the interrelationships between the two stages. It employs a qualitative approach through library research and descriptive-analytical methods. The data consist of relevant scholarly journal articles and previous studies, primarily published between 2021 and 2026, retrieved from Google Scholar, Garuda, DOAJ, and relevant journal websites. The literature was selected based on topical relevance, source credibility, and full-text availability, then analyzed through information selection, thematic categorization, cross-study comparison, and interpretive synthesis. The findings indicate that planning barriers include unaccommodated community aspirations, limited representative capacity, political intervention, and unequal influence in priority-setting. Implementation barriers involve weak interinstitutional coordination, limited budget transparency, and inadequate public oversight. Evidence from Tabulo Village indicates that community participation in organizing and monitoring reached only 18.4% and 19.3%, respectively. From a development sociology perspective, these barriers are interconnected with power relations, social trust, social capital, and institutional capacity. The study highlights the need for inclusive participation, transparent information, stronger institutional coordination, and sustained community involvement in monitoring and evaluation. As a literature-based study, its conclusions are limited to the scope and quality of the

sources reviewed and cannot be generalized statistically to all regions of Indonesia.

This is an open access article under the [CC BY-NC-SA 4.0](#) license



INTRODUCTION

Development is a social process aimed at improving societal well-being through changes in economic, social, institutional, and environmental conditions. In practice, development involves more than the provision of infrastructure or the achievement of physical targets; it also encompasses decision-making processes, resource allocation, intergroup relations, and community participation in determining the direction of change. Accordingly, the success of development is strongly influenced by the quality of its planning and implementation (Sunarso, 2023). Planning serves to identify community needs, establish priorities, formulate programmes, and determine the resources required, whereas implementation involves translating plans into concrete activities that generate tangible benefits for society. These two stages are interdependent, as weaknesses in planning may give rise to implementation problems, while implementation constraints may reveal discrepancies between programme designs and the social realities of the communities concerned (Djafar & AP, 2024). Development should therefore be understood not merely as an administrative and technical undertaking but also as a process with a social dimension that shapes the achievement of development objectives.

Development planning and implementation continue to face various obstacles, including low levels of community participation, unaddressed public aspirations, budgetary constraints, weak coordination, and competing interests. A study conducted in Sidorejo Kidul Urban Village, Salatiga, identified political intervention and the limited capacity of community representatives as significant challenges. These findings suggest that development outcomes depend, in part, on the ability to address obstacles from the planning stage onwards. From a development sociology perspective, such obstacles are associated with power relations, access to resources, and the social dynamics of communities (Fadillah et al., 2025). In their study of Wunut Village, Sidoarjo, they found that inadequate transparency and passive community participation impeded development planning. These issues can be examined through Sherry R. Arnstein's theory of citizen participation to assess the extent of community involvement in decision-making, Robert D. Putnam's concept of social capital to understand trust and cooperation, and the social conflict perspective to analyse competing interests and group dominance. Together, these theoretical perspectives help explain development barriers in social and institutional terms rather than solely as technical problems (Ainurrohman & Mursyidah, 2024).

Previous studies have examined barriers to development at both the planning and implementation stages. Kodarina and Fidiyani (2025) identified several obstacles to participatory planning in Sidorejo Kidul Urban Village, Salatiga, including unaddressed community aspirations, political intervention, and limited community capacity (Kodarina & Fidiyani, 2025). They found that the process of incorporating community aspirations through the Musrenbang (development planning consultation forum) in Deli Serdang District was constrained by the limited involvement of certain groups, inadequate public outreach,



budgetary limitations, and weak feedback mechanisms (Atmaja, 2026). At the implementation stage, Sakir (2024) demonstrated that development initiatives in Poleonro Village, Bone Regency, encountered challenges arising from limited administrative capacity, geographical conditions, and population dispersion. Nevertheless, further investigation is needed to establish a more integrated understanding of the relationship between planning and implementation barriers through the perspective of development sociology (Sakir et al., 2024).

The research gap addressed by this study lies in the need for an integrated analysis of the interrelationships among community participation, communication, power relations, competing interests, and institutional capacity throughout the development process. The novelty of this study lies in its analysis of the relationship between barriers at the planning and implementation stages through social, structural, and institutional dimensions. Rather than merely identifying inhibiting factors, the study examines how these factors are interconnected across the two stages. The study is theoretically significant because it contributes to the development sociology literature, while its practical relevance lies in informing efforts to strengthen community participation, improve coordination, enhance transparency, and align development programmes with community needs.

Against this background, this study aims to analyse the forms of barriers encountered during the planning and implementation stages of development, identify the underlying social, structural, and institutional factors, and explain the relationship between these two stages from a development sociology perspective. The study is expected to provide a more comprehensive understanding of development as a social process involving interactions among government institutions, development implementers, and communities. Furthermore, it seeks to establish an analytical foundation for strengthening community participation, improving institutional coordination, and aligning development planning with community needs and prevailing social conditions. Accordingly, development should be assessed not only in terms of the successful physical delivery of programmes but also in terms of the quality of the social processes underpinning decision-making, programme implementation, and the distribution of development benefits.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The Concept of Development from a Development Sociology Perspective

Development is a process of social change aimed at improving societal well-being. From a sociological perspective, development success is measured not only by physical infrastructure development but also by community participation, the equitable distribution of benefits, and power relations (Astarika & Romli, 2026). Therefore, development initiatives should take community needs into account and foster collaboration between government institutions and citizens (Diatmika & Rahayu, 2022).

Development Planning

Development planning is the stage at which community needs are identified, priorities are established, and programmes are formulated. This process requires transparency, coordination, and community participation. However, *Musrenbang* (development planning consultation forums) do not necessarily accommodate all community aspirations because of political intervention, limited community capacity, and proposals that are not incorporated into development plans (Nurwanda & Nursetiawan, 2025).

Development Implementation

Development implementation involves translating plans into concrete actions through resource management and collaboration among various stakeholders. Obstacles may arise from budgetary constraints, weak coordination, limited implementation capacity, and insufficient community involvement. Consequently, successful implementation depends not only on the availability of resources but also on cooperation and trust between government institutions and communities (Lestari Wulandari & SH, 2025).

Barriers to Development Planning and Implementation

Development barriers encompass social, institutional, political, and technical dimensions. These challenges include low levels of community participation, the dominance of particular groups, inadequate transparency, weak coordination, and limited financial and human resources (Djafar & AP, 2024). Furthermore, limited access to information and inadequate feedback mechanisms within *Musrenbang* have been associated with political interference and weak coordination in the formulation of Regional Government Work Plans (*Rencana Kerja Pemerintah Daerah*, RKPD). These findings indicate that development barriers are related not only to technical constraints but also to social relations and governance arrangements (Maulani, 2025).

Community Participation Theory

Sherry R. Arnstein's theory of citizen participation explains that community involvement occurs at different levels, ranging from formal participation to meaningful engagement that enables citizens to exert substantive influence over decision-making. This theory is used to assess whether communities genuinely participate in determining development priorities and implementation processes or merely attend consultation forums without having a meaningful influence on the decisions made (Wahyuni & Sudirman, 2026).

Social Capital and Social Conflict Theories

Social capital theory emphasises the importance of trust, social networks, and cooperation in supporting development. Low levels of trust may hinder coordination, while competing interests and power inequalities may influence the determination of development priorities and the distribution of benefits. This perspective helps explain why community participation does not always occur equitably or provide all groups with equal opportunities to influence development decisions (Sukmana et al., 2025).

Previous Studies and the Research Gap

Previous studies have examined development barriers from various perspectives. Rizky, Adnan, and Alfirdaus (2024) investigated barriers to participatory planning in Sidorejo Kidul Urban Village, whereas Nadhiro and Choiriyah (2024) examined community participation in village development planning in Suko, Sidoarjo. Wamo, Maryani, and Azikin (2025) explored community participation in the formulation of the Regional Government Work Plan (RKPD) in Jayawijaya, while Maulani (2025) evaluated the implementation of good governance principles in *Musrenbang* forums in Central Java. Overall, these studies highlight recurring challenges concerning the representation of community aspirations, transparency, coordination, and the extent of public influence over development decisions.

Nevertheless, the present study can contribute to this body of literature by integrating barriers encountered during the planning and implementation stages into a single sociological analysis. In particular, it examines the interrelationships among community participation, power relations, social capital, and institutional capacity. This

research gap should be regarded as a provisional analytical direction that requires confirmation through a more comprehensive literature review, rather than as a definitive claim that the relationship between these two stages has not previously been investigated (Maulani, 2025; Nadhiro & Choiriyah, 2024; Wamo et al., 2025).

RESEARCH METHODS

This study adopts a qualitative approach using the library research method and descriptive-analytical analysis to examine barriers to development planning and implementation from a development sociology perspective. Data were obtained from scholarly journal articles and previous studies, particularly publications from 2021 to 2026, retrieved through Google Scholar, Garuda, the Directory of Open Access Journals (DOAJ), and relevant journal websites. The literature was selected based on its relevance to the research topic, source credibility, and the availability of full-text publications. The analysis focused on community participation, priority setting, transparency, interinstitutional coordination, power relations, social capital, and constraints related to budgets and implementation resources.

Data analysis involved three stages: selecting relevant information, categorising and comparing findings across the literature, and drawing conclusions. The findings were examined to identify social, political, institutional, and technical barriers affecting both development planning and implementation. The results were subsequently interpreted through the lens of development sociology, with particular emphasis on community participation, trust, cooperation, and power inequalities.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Barriers to Development Planning

Development planning is a crucial stage in identifying needs, establishing priorities, and formulating programmes based on community aspirations. However, the planning process may be hindered when community proposals are not accommodated or when decisions are influenced predominantly by institutional and political interests (Djafar & AP, 2024). A concrete example can be found in a study by Rizky, Adnan, and Alfirdaus on the *Musrenbang* (development planning consultation forum) in Sidorejo Kidul Urban Village, Salatiga. The study identified several constraints, including proposals that had not been incorporated into development plans, the sectoral priorities of local government agencies, political intervention, lengthy waiting periods for the implementation of proposed initiatives, and the limited capacity of community representatives. These findings indicate that the organisation of a *Musrenbang* does not necessarily ensure that all community aspirations become development priorities (Albar & Hambali, 2024).

Quantitative data from a study by Sante, Masinambow, and Sumual (2023) in Tabulo Village, Mananggu District, Boalemo Regency, provide a more measurable illustration of challenges related to community participation. The study reported community participation rates of 37.2% in planning, 38.6% in implementation, 18.4% in organising, and 19.3% in monitoring. The reported average participation rate across these dimensions was 34.42%, which the researchers classified as low. These figures indicate that community involvement in organising and monitoring was lower than involvement in planning and implementation in the study area. Nevertheless, these findings reflect the conditions in Tabulo Village as measured by the original study and cannot be generalised to all villages in Indonesia (Sante et al., 2023).

From a development sociology perspective, these issues are associated with the distribution of power and the opportunities available to communities to influence decision-making. Residents may attend planning forums, yet their influence may remain limited when priority-setting decisions depend entirely on those who hold formal authority. This situation highlights the distinction between formal participation and substantive participation. Participatory planning therefore requires more than providing deliberative forums; it also requires clear explanations of why particular proposals are accepted, deferred, or rejected. The study *The Participation Gap in Indonesian Regional Development and Democracy* (2025) also identifies a tendency for participation to be more prominent during planning than during implementation, monitoring, and evaluation (Yonatan Pering et al., 2026).

Barriers to Development Implementation

At the implementation stage, obstacles may arise when development plans are not supported by adequate coordination, budget management, transparency, and oversight. A concrete example can be found in a study of village budget management under the Anggaran Pendapatan dan Belanja Desa (APBDes, Village Budget) in Tuguis Village, Tabaru District, West Halmahera Regency. The study identified delays in preparing village financial plans, insufficient coordination among the village head, the Village Consultative Council (Badan Permusyawaratan Desa, BPD), and the Community Empowerment Institution (Lembaga Pemberdayaan Masyarakat, LPM), as well as inadequate transparency in reporting budget accountability to the public. These findings demonstrate that barriers to development implementation are not solely related to the availability of funding but also to governance arrangements and the allocation of responsibilities among institutions (Astuti et al., 2025).

Another obstacle is the limited involvement of communities in monitoring development outcomes. Data from Tabulo Village indicate that participation in monitoring reached only 19.3%, compared with 37.2% in planning and 38.6% in implementation. In this context, limited community oversight may restrict residents' opportunities to assess whether planned programmes correspond to the activities actually carried out. However, these figures do not, in themselves, demonstrate the existence of budgetary irregularities; rather, they indicate a low level of participation in monitoring according to the measurements used in the original study. Accordingly, access to budget information, progress reports, and community involvement in evaluation should form an integral part of the development process (Sante et al., 2023).

Analysing Development Barriers from a Development Sociology Perspective

From a development sociology perspective, barriers to planning and implementation are associated with the relationships among government institutions, implementing agencies, and communities. Sherry R. Arnstein's theory of citizen participation helps explain why residents' attendance at deliberative forums does not necessarily mean that they possess the power to influence decisions. The case of Sidorejo Kidul demonstrates that community aspirations can be expressed but may still encounter obstacles during priority-setting and the implementation of proposed initiatives. Meanwhile, the case of Tuguis Village highlights the importance of institutional coordination and accountability. Together, these cases demonstrate that successful development requires both meaningful participation and transparent governance (Zain et

al., 2026).

Beyond power relations, social capital in the form of trust, communication, and cooperation also influences the development process. When communities lack adequate information about decisions or programme progress, public trust in government may weaken, potentially reducing the effectiveness of participation. Conversely, open communication and feedback mechanisms can help reconcile community interests with government policies. The study *The Participation Gap in Indonesian Regional Development and Democracy* (2025) emphasises that participation should continue through monitoring and evaluation rather than end after the *Musrenbang*. Accordingly, development barriers need to be addressed through both improvements in social relations and stronger institutional systems (Wisadirana et al., 2024).

Strategies for Addressing Development Barriers

Based on a comparative analysis of the literature, efforts to address development barriers should be integrated across the planning and implementation stages. During planning, governments need to improve access to information regarding *Musrenbang* schedules, priority-setting criteria, budget availability, and the status of proposals submitted by community members. Greater transparency should be accompanied by inclusive mechanisms for expressing community aspirations to ensure that participation is not dominated by particular groups but also encompasses women, young people, vulnerable groups, and communities that have historically been underrepresented. In a study conducted in Padang Brahrang Village, Kayupa (2025) found that participation remained dominated by certain groups and that access to important information was often restricted to the *Musrenbang* forum. These findings indicate that meaningful participation requires broader access to information and equal opportunities for communities to influence development decisions (Kayupa et al., 2025).

In addition to broadening community involvement, governments need to establish clear systems for recording and following up on proposals. Each proposal should be documented and categorised according to community needs and priority levels. Information should then be provided regarding whether the proposal has been accepted, deferred, or rejected, together with an explanation that can be justified and held accountable. This approach is relevant to Saputri's study of participatory development planning in Sidorejo Kidul Urban Village, Salatiga, which identified several obstacles, including proposals that had not been accommodated, political intervention, the sectoral orientation of local government agencies, lengthy implementation periods, and the limited capacity of community representatives. Thus, planning problems cannot be resolved simply by increasing attendance at deliberative forums; they also require mechanisms that ensure proposals can be tracked and that community needs are meaningfully connected to government decision (Saputri, 2025).

At the implementation stage, improvement efforts should focus on strengthening interinstitutional coordination, ensuring transparency in budget utilisation, enhancing oversight, and improving progress reporting. Village governments, Village Consultative Councils (BPDs), community empowerment institutions, and development implementing bodies need clearly defined responsibilities, work schedules, and reporting procedures to prevent programme delays caused by poor communication or unclear accountability. A study by Dioniki, Rorong, and Rares on the role of the APBDes in development in Tuguis Village, West Halmahera, identified delays in village financial planning, suboptimal

coordination among the village government, BPD, and LPM, and limited transparency in reporting budget accountability to the public. These findings demonstrate that budgets must not merely be formally allocated or made available; they must also be managed through coordination and accountability mechanisms that the public can understand and scrutinise (Firmanto, 2026).

Furthermore, community oversight should be integrated into the development process from implementation through evaluation rather than conducted only after activities have been completed. Governments can provide periodic reports on budget utilisation, project progress, implementation challenges, and achievements through public information boards, community forums, or accessible digital media. Communities should also be given opportunities to submit complaints and receive responses to the issues they raise. This approach is consistent with the study by Nadhiro and Choiriyah (2024) on development planning in Suko Village, Sidoarjo, which describes community involvement at several planning stages and the role of community representatives in formulating village development plans. These findings provide a basis for emphasising the importance of sustained community involvement, although the effectiveness of oversight mechanisms during implementation requires further empirical investigation (Nadhiro & Choiriyah, 2024).

From a development sociology perspective, these strategies are associated with improving relations between government and communities. Transparency can strengthen public trust, equitable representation can reduce the dominance of particular groups, and joint coordination and oversight can enhance accountability among stakeholders. Therefore, development success depends not only on budget availability and the technical capacity of government institutions but also on the quality of social relations, the distribution of authority, and communities' opportunities to influence decisions. Based on this literature synthesis, improvements should connect community aspirations with priority-setting, align planning with budget implementation, and ensure that development activities can be monitored and evaluated transparently. However, because this study employs library research, these recommendations constitute a conceptual synthesis of previous studies and should not be interpreted as strategies that have been empirically demonstrated to be effective across all regions of Indonesia (Nasyirudin, 2025).

Synthesis of the Mini-Research Findings

Based on a comparative review of the literature, barriers to development planning and implementation in Indonesia are interconnected problems that cannot be understood solely in terms of separate administrative stages. At the planning stage, obstacles include community aspirations that have not been fully accommodated, the limited capacity of community representatives, the dominance of particular groups, and the influence of political and institutional interests on priority-setting. At the implementation stage, barriers are reflected in weak interinstitutional coordination, limited transparency in budget utilisation, and inadequate community oversight. The findings of Rizky, Adnan, and Alfirdaus (2024) on participatory development planning in Sidorejo Kidul Urban Village, Salatiga, indicate that difficulties in integrating proposed initiatives into planning data, the sectoral orientation of local government agencies, political intervention, delays in implementing proposals, and the limited capacity of community representatives can impede the planning process. These findings are consistent with a study by Ali and Ridwan (2025) in Padang Brahrang Village, which identified the dominance of particular groups

and limited public access to development information. Both studies demonstrate that the availability of deliberative forums does not automatically guarantee equal opportunities for all community groups to influence development decisions.

Quantitative evidence of community participation is provided by the study conducted by Sante, Masinambow, and Sumual (2023) in Tabulo Village, Mananggu District, Boalemo Regency. The study reported participation rates of 37.2% in planning, 38.6% in implementation, 18.4% in organising, and 19.3% in monitoring. The average participation rate across these four dimensions was reported as 34.42%, which the researchers classified as low. These data demonstrate that community involvement needs to be considered not only during the formulation of plans but also in organising implementing bodies and monitoring development activities. The lower percentages for organising and monitoring may indicate challenges in sustaining community engagement after the planning process has concluded. Nevertheless, these percentages are specific to Tabulo Village and cannot be assumed to represent participation levels in all villages across Indonesia.

Challenges at the implementation stage are also illustrated by research on APBDes management in Tuguis Village, Tabaru District, West Halmahera Regency. The study identified delays in preparing village financial plans, suboptimal coordination among the village head, BPD, and LPM, and shortcomings in budget accountability and oversight transparency. More recent findings by Septian and Permana (2025) in Gotputuk Village, Blora, indicate that budget transparency may be constrained by limited administrative capacity, low digital literacy, and a closed bureaucratic culture. The study also cautions that displaying public information boards or organising deliberative meetings may not be effective when the information provided is difficult for community members to understand. Meanwhile, Nirmalaningtyas and Husodo (2025) emphasise the importance of an integrated village fund oversight system that involves supervisory institutions and provides opportunities for community participation. This comparison indicates that transparency involves more than disclosing budget information; it also requires ensuring that the information is understandable, verifiable, and usable by communities in monitoring development implementation.

Sociologically, these findings can be explained through the relationships among participation, power relations, social capital, and institutional capacity. Meaningful participation enables communities to influence priority-setting, whereas unequal power relations may allow the aspirations of certain groups to outweigh the needs of others. Conversely, trust and cooperation among communities, village governments, and representative institutions can strengthen coordination and oversight. Research by Usman and Yaya on transparency, accountability, community participation, and village development also found that transparency and participation had positive and statistically significant effects on village development within the context of their study. This finding reinforces the argument that development depends not only on financial resources and technical planning but also on the quality of governance and relationships between government and communities. Nevertheless, findings from a single research location cannot be directly generalised to all regions of Indonesia.

In conclusion, this mini-research synthesis indicates that barriers to development planning and implementation form an interconnected chain of problems. Community aspirations that are not accommodated during planning may undermine public trust and reduce community involvement during implementation. Conversely, weak coordination,

limited budget transparency, and inadequate oversight may widen the gap between development plans and actual outcomes. Improvements should therefore be pursued continuously through stronger community representation, systematic recording and follow-up of proposals, enhanced capacity among public officials and community representatives, greater transparency in budget information, and participatory oversight mechanisms. Because this mini-research employs a literature-based approach, these conclusions represent a synthesis of previous studies rather than a direct assessment of national development conditions. Furthermore, differences in research locations, methods, indicators, and publication years limit direct comparisons across findings. Future research could test these patterns through case studies of several villages or urban communities, comparing planning processes, programme implementation, and oversight mechanisms.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of the literature review, barriers to development planning and implementation in Indonesia are associated with low levels of community participation, unaccommodated community aspirations, political interests, weak interinstitutional coordination, and inadequate transparency and oversight. Research findings from Tabulo Village indicate that community participation in organising accounted for only 18.4%, while participation in monitoring reached 19.3%. Meanwhile, a study conducted in Sidorejo Kidul Urban Village, Salatiga, identified constraints in incorporating community aspirations and determining development priorities. From a development sociology perspective, these barriers are not merely technical in nature but are also associated with power relations, trust, social capital, and institutional capacity. The practical implications of this study highlight the need to improve information transparency, strengthen community representation in decision-making, enhance interinstitutional coordination, and involve residents in development monitoring and evaluation. This study is limited by its reliance on secondary data from the available literature; consequently, its findings depend on the scope and quality of the sources reviewed and may not fully reflect conditions across all regions of Indonesia. Future research should therefore adopt a field-based approach involving interviews, observations, or case studies across several regions to gain a deeper understanding of the experiences of communities and government institutions, while comparing barriers to development planning and implementation across different social contexts.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ainurrohman, M. A., & Mursyidah, L. (2024). Overcoming Barriers In Infrastructure Development Planning And Community Involvement: Mengatasi Hambatan Dalam Perencanaan Pembangunan Infrastruktur Dan Keterlibatan Masyarakat. *Indonesian Journal Of Cultural And Community Development*, 15(3), 10–21070.
- Albar, M. R., & Hambali, H. (2024). Efektivitas Tahapan Perencanaan Pembangunan Dalam (Musrenbang) Di Kecamatan Pohjentrek Kabupaten Pasuruan. *Almufi Jurnal Sosial Dan Humaniora*, 1(3), 243–253.
- Astarika, D., & Romli, K. (2026). Perencanaan, Pelaksanaan, Dan Evaluasi Pembangunan Berbasis Masyarakat: Kajian Sosiologis Melalui Library Research. *Jurnal Media Akademik (Jma)*, 4(10).
- Astuti, A. D., Wafiq, N. A., Ervina, Y., Putri, A., Zakiah, H., Bengo, K., Program, P., & Desa, P. (2025). Efektivitas Pelaksanaan Program Effectiveness Of The

- Implementation Of. *Jurnal Pemikiran Dan Penelitian Ilmu-Ilmu Sosial, Hukum, & Pengajarannya*, Xx(1), 237–246.
- Atmaja, Y. (2026). Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Perumusan Kebijakan Publik: Studi Tentang Implementasi Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan (Musrenbang) Di Pemerintah Daerah Kabupaten Deli Serdang: Public Participation In Public Policy Formulation: A Study On The Implementation Of The Development Planning Deliberation (Musrenbang) In The Regional Government Of Deli Serdang Regency. *Sakinah Journal Of Social Sciences And Administrative Sciences (Sjossas)*, 1(2), 28–41.
- Diatmika, I. P. G., & Rahayu, S. (2022). *Model Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Masyarakat Lokal Dan Peran Pemerintah*. Ahlimedia Book.
- Djafar, F., & Ap, S. (2024). *Aspirasi Publik Dan Kapasitas Lembaga Dalam Perencanaan Pembangunan*. Mega Press Nusantara.
- Fadillah, M. S., Anggraini, D. R., & Asdianty, S. (2025). Studi Literatur: Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pengelolaan Dana Kelurahan Bagi Pembangunan Pada Kelurahan Bagan Besar Timur. *Jurnal Riset Multidisiplin Edukasi*, 2(12), 1576–1589.
- Firmanto, T. (2026). Akuntabilitas Hukum Pengelolaan Dana Desa Berbasis Kompetensi Aparatur Dan Komitmen Kelembagaan. *Seikat: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Politik Dan Hukum*, 5(4), 3108–3120.
- Kayupa, O. O., Guampe, F., Hengkeng, J., & Balo, M. J. (2025). Tantangan Dan Peluang Implementasi Perencanaan Pembangunan Partisipatif Desa-Desa Di Indonesia. *Studi Ilmu Manajemen Dan Organisasi*, 6(1), 187–199.
- Kodarina, R. N., & Fidiyani, R. (2025). Perbandingan Partisipasi Masyarakat Atas Program Kota Tanpa Kumuh (Kotaku) Di Kota Semarang. *Bookchapter Hukum Dan Lingkungan*, 1, 1633–1657.
- Lestari Wulandari, S., & Sh, M. H. (2025). *Hukum Perjanjian Dalam Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal (Kontrak Investasi, Infrastruktur, Dan Pemberdayaan Lokal)*. Penerbit: Kramantara Js.
- Maulani, A. (2025). Evaluasi Implementasi Good Governance Dalam Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah: Studi Atas Praktik Musrenbang Di Provinsi Jawa Tengah. *Sosio Dialektika*, 87–98.
- 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.
- Nurwanda, A., & Nursetiawan, I. (2025). Partisipasi Masyarakat Pada Musyawarah Rencana Pembangunan Fisik Di Desa Mekarmukti Kecamatan Cisaga Kabupaten Ciamis. *Journal Sains Student Research*, 3(5), 741–756.
- Sakir, A. R., Amaliah, Y., & Lukman, J. P. (2024). Strategi Pemerintah Desa Dalam Meningkatkan Partisipasi Perempuan Dalam Pembangunan Di Desa Poleonro Kecamatan Lamuru Kabupaten Bone. *Hulondalo Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan Dan Ilmu Komunikasi*, 3(1), 619609.
- Sante, E., Masinambow, V. A. J., & Sumual, J. I. (2023). Analisis Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pembangunan Desa (Studi: Desa Tabulo Kecamatan Mananggu Kabupaten Boalemo). *Jurnal Berkala Ilmiah Efisiensi*, 23(1), 109–120.
- Saputri, A. R. (2025). Implementasi Rumah Dataku Sebagai Basis Data Dan Informasi Di Tingkat Desa/Kelurahan. *Prosiding Pemerintahan Dan Desa*, 1(1), 166–180.

- Sukmana, O., Damanik, F. H. S., Sianipar, G., Yuliyantini, Y., Lairing, N., Daulay, P., Ramadhany, A. N. C., Machdum, S. V., Muhammad, G., & Saragih, M. W. (2025). *Gerakan Sosial Dan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat*. Star Digital Publishing.
- Sunarso, B. (2023). *Sosiologi Pembangunan Desa*. Uwais Inspirasi Indonesia.
- Wahyuni, S., & Sudirman, R. (2026). Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Kebijakan Publik: Memperkuat Demokrasi Dan Meningkatkan Kepercayaan Masyarakat Terhadap Pemerintah. *Takuana: Jurnal Pendidikan, Sains, Dan Humaniora*, 4(4), 2196–2206.
- Wamo, A., Maryani, D., & Azikin, A. (2025). Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Penyusunan Rencana Kerja Pemerintah Daerah Tahun 2025 Di Kabupaten Jayawijaya Provinsi Papua Pegunungan. *Jurnal Kajian Pemerintah: Journal Of Government, Social And Politics*, 11(2), 689–700.
- Wisadirana, D., Chawa, A. F., Susanti, A., Izana, N. N., Sari, Q. I. P., Siwi, L. P., Kartika, A., & Amalia, B. R. (2024). *Pendayagunaan Kapital Sosial Dalam Pemberdayaan Masyarakat*. Universitas Brawijaya Press.
- Yonatan Pering, S. E., Doeka, E., Sos, S., Haumeni, I. R., Sos, S., Ap, M., Haning, Y., Ip, S., & Sos, M. (2026). *Partisipasi Elite Agama Dalam Pengawasan Pembangunan Daerah*. Kaizen Media Publishing.
- Zain, I. H. A. M. M., Ibrahim, I. H., & Sp, M. S. (2026). *Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Konsep, Strategi, Dan Praktik Pengembangan Program Berbasis Partisipasi*. Pt Ghani Press Group.