



Journal of Governance
and Local Politics

ISSN (online) : 2684-9992

JGLP

Journal of Governance and Local Politics

Journal of Governance and Local Politics (JGLP)	Vol. 4	No. 1	Page 001-124	May 2022	ISSN 1684-9992
---	--------	-------	--------------	----------	----------------



JGLP

Journal of Governance and Local Politics

1-11	Konflik Partai Gerindra dan PKS dalam Proses Pengisian Kekosongan Posisi Wakil Gubernur DKI Jakarta Dinda Mutia Khaerun Nisa, Sri Budi Eko Wardani
12-21	Reproduksi Kuasa: Politik Etnis Tionghoa dalam Kontestasi Pemilihan Legislatif Kota Makassar) Asfar Mutaaly Bareilly, Gustiana A Kambo, Muhammad
22-32	Politik Pencalonan Pasangan Suami-Istri pada Pemilihan Kepala Desa di Desa Sekaran Kabupaten Bojonegoro dan Desa Lembor Kabupaten Lamongan Anang Fajrul Ukhwaluddin, Valina Singka Subekti
33 – 46	Oposisi Masyarakat Sipil Kontra Hegemoni Negara Melalui Media Sosial Youtube di Era Pemerintahan Presiden Joko Widodo Ali Ikhwan, Sri Budi Eko Wardani
47 – 54	Kebijakan Pemerintah Kota Palangka Raya Tentang Penerapan Protokol Kesehatan Covid-19 di Era New Normal Sadar
56 – 69	The Constraining Dynamics to Promote the Inclusive Village Governance in an Autocratic Leadership Setting Muhammad Taufiq, Rahmad Hidayat
70 – 84	Sinergitas Pemerintah Kabupaten Sidoarjo dengan Kodim 0816 Sidoarjo Dalam Upaya Pemulihan Ekonomi di Masa Pandemi Covid-19 Dewi Kurniasih, Aulia Zharifah
85 – 102	Collective Action Kelompok Sadar Wisata (Pokdarwis) dalam Percepatan Pariwisata Desa Labuan Kertasari untuk Peningkatan Ekonomi Masyarakat Ilham Zitri
103 – 117	Mengukur Kualitas Pelayanan Publik Dinas Kependudukan dan Catatan Sipil Kabupaten Lombok Barat Rifaid, M. Ulfatul Akbar Jafar, M. Taufik Rachman, Johan Natirius
118 – 124	Kolaborasi Pemerintah Daerah dalam Pelestarian Tradisi Lisan Iko-Iko Suku Bajau Di Sulawesi Tenggara Abdul Hakim

The Constraining Dynamics to Promote the Inclusive Village Governance in an Autocratic Leadership Setting

Muhammad Taufiq¹, Rahmad Hidayat²

^{1,2}STISIP Mbojo, Bima, Jl. Piere Tendean Mande II, Bima, 84111

Corresponding Author: muhammادتaufiqawahab@gmail.com

Keyword:
Autocracy;
Inclusive Governance;
Village Development.

Abstract: This article discusses the implementation dynamics of the Village Law in a certain context which was backgrounded by the village head's autocratic leadership style that tends to hinder the agenda for institutionalizing inclusive governance based on social justice in the village development management. Accountability and citizen engagement as the foundation of term inclusive governance are the principal factors that must be implemented by the Village Government in their routine tasks. As qualitative research with a case study approach, this research utilized a purposive sampling technique to determine the key informants targeted from the elements of the government and villagers. To limit the focus of interest, this research only presents a discussion about the implementation dynamics of the Village Law with the setting of the leadership style of the Village Head in the 2011-2017 period. Field findings show that Dorokobo Village, Kempo District, Dompu Regency have complex socio-economic problems, thus requiring the presence of a responsive government and active villagers to jointly manage various development activities. Unfortunately, expectations of ideal leadership are not widely found in the past structure of the Village Government because they were only busy with various administrative activities and absent from substantive matters. Political leaders came with a procedural and even autocratic style so that the regular participation spaces were limited opened by only involving the elite without the presence of all components of the community. The absence of a progressive process to develop institutional accountability was due to the lack of power that can compel the Village Government to apply the principles of accountability and transparency in their activities.

Kata Kunci:
Autokrasi;
Pemerintahan Inklusif;
Pembangunan Desa.

Abstrak: Artikel ini membahas dinamika implementasi UU Desa dalam konteks tertentu yang dilatarbelakangi gaya kepemimpinan otokratis kepala desa yang cenderung menghambat agenda pelebagaan pemerintahan inklusif berbasis keadilan sosial dalam pengelolaan pembangunan desa. Akuntabilitas dan pelibatan warga sebagai landasan istilah pemerintahan inklusif merupakan faktor utama yang harus dilaksanakan oleh Pemerintah Desa dalam tugas rutinnnya. Sebagai penelitian kualitatif dengan pendekatan studi kasus, penelitian ini menggunakan teknik purposive sampling untuk menentukan target informan kunci dari unsur pemerintah dan masyarakat desa. Untuk membatasi fokus perhatian, penelitian ini hanya menyajikan pembahasan tentang dinamika implementasi UU Desa berlatar gaya kepemimpinan Kepala Desa periode 2011-2017. Temuan lapangan menunjukkan bahwa Desa Dorokobo Kecamatan Kempo Kabupaten Dompu memiliki permasalahan sosial ekonomi yang kompleks, sehingga membutuhkan kehadiran pemerintah yang responsif dan warga aktif untuk bersama-sama mengelola berbagai kegiatan pembangunan. Sayangnya, harapan kepemimpinan yang ideal tidak banyak ditemukan pada struktur Pemerintahan Desa masa lalu karena hanya disibukkan dengan berbagai kegiatan administratif dan absen dari hal-hal substantif. Para pemimpin politik datang dengan gaya prosedural bahkan otokratis sehingga ruang partisipasi reguler sebatas dibuka hanya dengan melibatkan elit tanpa kehadiran seluruh komponen masyarakat. Tidak adanya proses progresif untuk mengembangkan akuntabilitas kelembagaan disebabkan oleh kurangnya kekuatan yang dapat memaksa Pemerintah Desa untuk menerapkan prinsip-prinsip akuntabilitas dan transparansi dalam kegiatannya.

INTRODUCTION

The issuance of Law No. 6/2014 on Village marks the presence of a new era in the management of development in Indonesia. This law provides enormous opportunities and flexibility for the village's strategic actors to improve the welfare of residents. Villages, which in the past were often the object of development policies, now have broader authority to formulate policies and carry out their development. The village has been transformed into a subject that plays an active role as a driving force for development. Amid the New Order legacy which is still deeply rooted in village life to this day in the form of weak organizational and institutional capabilities of civil society, the issuance of the Village Law has opened up wide opportunities for the creation of new models of village governance, designing it as an arena for developing democratic local capacity through the civic engagement scenarios (Priyono, 2017).

The village development aims to improve the welfare of life and reduce poverty through the fulfilment of basic needs, development of village facilities and infrastructure, development of local economic potential, and sustainable use of natural resources. In this framework, the village government is given the authority to manage governance and implementation of development independently to improve the quality of life of the residents. The village government is expected to be able to utilize its institutional capabilities in managing governmental tasks and the various resources it has, including the management of village finances and assets. Such a big role is accepted by the village government, of course, accompanied by a great responsibility as well.

The intention to create village independence is supported by the granting of great authority to the village government to develop villages based on ownership of origin rights and local authority on a village scale. The criteria for this village-scale local authority include (a) authority that prioritizes service activities and community empowerment; (b) authority that has the scope of regulation and activities only within the territory and village community that has an impact on the internal village; (c) authority related to the daily needs and interests of the village community; (d) Activities that have been carried out by the village based on the village initiatives; (e) National Government, Provincial governments, and Regency/Municipal governments as well as third parties programs that have been submitted and managed by the village; and (f) village-scale local authority which has been regulated in-laws and regulations concerning the division of authority of the Government, Provincial Government, and Regency/City Government (Permendesa PDTT No. 1/2015).

In this regard, the village government needs to carry out development stages consisting of (i) Planning; (ii) Budgeting; (iii) Implementation; (iv) Reporting; and (v) Monitoring and Supervision. The process of independently planning, budgeting, implementing, and evaluating the village development activities is a tangible manifestation of the authority to regulate and manage various local village-scale development authorities as mentioned above. Under the will of the Village Law, village development governance must be implemented by prioritizing the spirit of togetherness, kinship, and cooperation to realize the mainstreaming of social justice. In other words, village development management must be accountable and inclusive in which all village development activities or programs must be able to be accounted for by the village government to residents following the provisions of the law while involving all levels of society at all stages of village development management. Accountability and citizen engagement, as the foundation of the term inclusive governance, are the principal factor that must be applied by the village government in the routine of development management.

In the spectrum of political science and public administration, the concept of inclusive governance is often used interchangeably with the terms democratic governance, deliberative governance, participatory governance, and negotiable governance because they have the same scope or content, namely accountability and citizen engagement (participation). Transparency and legitimacy are complementary substances that are also reviewed when discussing principles or values that are closely related to these concepts.

Inclusive governance is a mandate of the Village Law which should be created when the village government carries out governmental, developmental and community tasks in the context of realizing public welfare in the village. Inclusive governance refers to a normative sensibility

that stands in favour of inclusion as the benchmark against which institutions can be judged and also be promoted (Hickey, 2015). Inclusion in governance affirms the participation of citizens in any institution, and it is regarded as participatory democracy or deliberative democracy. The combination of voice and accountability should, in turn, generate outcomes that contribute to inclusive development because, by this logic, state authorities that are accountable to their people should use resources constructively rather than misspend or steal them (Carothers & Brechenmacher, 2014; Gaventa & Barrett, 2010; Rocha Menocal, 2012; Grindle, 2010).

Citizen participation and civil society engagement are important drivers of inclusive governance (Mitlin, 2004; Thompson & Tapscott, 2010). Inclusive governance emphasizes governance arrangements that promote the inclusion of the people in particular the poor and marginalized. It emphasizes the need to introduce mechanisms to encourage the involvement of those who do not find it easy to participate in state structures and processes because they are generally far removed from their own cultures and practices (Mitlin, 2004, p.4).

Increasing citizens' voice in governance processes, not only in terms of their participation but also in terms of their influence, should make public institutions more responsive to citizen needs and demands, especially those from groups that have been traditionally marginalized and otherwise excluded. This process of inclusion and engagement from a broad variety of stakeholders should also act as a check on public institutions and hold governments to account (OECD, 2020, p.17). Through the rights and freedoms that inclusive processes bestow (eg political voice, freedom of assembly, free press, free flow of information, open participation in political decision making, etc.), citizens can expect to see policy decisions made in ways that are inclusive, participatory, representative of different societal groups and interests, transparent, and accountable (Rocha Menocal, 2012).

At all stages of development, the Village Government is obliged to involve residents to participate in determining strategic decisions in regular civic forums whose implementation is facilitated by the Village Consultative Body (*Badan Permusyawaratan Desa/BPD*) and/or the Village Government itself. These regular civic forums are in the form of a Village Deliberation (*Musyawarah Desa/Musdes*) and/or a Village Development Planning Consultation (*Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan Desa/Musrenbangdes*) which be positioned as an annual routine village planning meeting where the participation of residents in it is a condition for fulfilling deliberative legitimacy, in addition to the presence of other important elements, namely Village Government (Village Head and Apparatus) and *BPD*. Both types of forums are categorized as Government-Sponsored Participatory Initiatives.

Cornwall (2004a) termed it "Invited Spaces" namely inclusive spaces legitimately provided 'from above' by the government in which citizens are invited to participate. Meanwhile, Bee (2017) positions it in the category of "active citizenship as a practice stimulated by public institutions" where public participation in policymaking is possible because of the top-down pattern. Through the involvement of all parties, work programs and activities will automatically be produced to accommodate the interests (needs) of the community in an inclusive manner based on village resources and capabilities. This kind of involvement of all levels of society is the application of inclusive governance values oriented to mainstreaming social justice in village development governance.

Inclusive governance is a prerequisite for the creation of social justice in the domain of village development management. The concepts of inclusive governance and social justice both contain the principles of accountability, transparency, legitimacy, and participation as their substantive scope. Social justice can be conceptualized as a combination of both distributive and procedural justice. Distributive justice refers to the distribution of limited goods and resources based on the principles of equity, need, or equality. And procedural justice focuses on the influence during the decision-making process relative to other groups (Reason & Davis, 2005).

Such a combination is a goal toward full and equal participation for all groups, equitable and fair distribution of goods and services, and an environment where all members are physically and psychologically safe and secure (Adams, Bell, & Griffin, 1997; Ayers, Hunt, & Quinn, 1998; Oakes & Lipton, 2003; as cited by Agarwal, 2008, p.20). Social justice implies a commitment to fairness in our dealings with each other in the major aspects of our lives—the political, economic,

social and civic realms. It should foster equal human rights, distributive justice, and a structure of opportunity and be grounded in representative and participatory democracy (Weil, 2004, p.8).

According to the current context, after 7 years of the implementation of the Village Law, several problems and pessimistic attitudes have surfaced. The agenda for the realization of participatory, inclusive, and socially just village development management is often deadlocked, not as smooth as it was originally intended. Common complaints that are openly presented in the national mass media regarding the implementation of the Village Law in various regions are related to the problem of socio-political relations between strategic actors (Village Government, *BPD*, Residents) which are too weak when responding to the implementation of the village regulations. The weak bond of socio-political relations between these actors results in the complexity of the practice of accountability, transparency, and participation in the management of village development.

Passions in utilizing the regular civic forums, such as the *Musdes*, to celebrate village democratization, looking sluggish, defeated by the frenzy of village fund administration that stirs village heads and their apparatus. Instead of organizing themselves to prepare for the institutionalization of the *Musdes* as a forum for inclusive community meetings, village elites go back and forth to the Regency Government Offices and places of technical guidance related to village financial management. This situation means that village democracy is still running on paper and has not been engraved in the hearts of all power holders in the village (Mariana et. al., 2017, p.18-19).

Citizens' awareness about the ownership of critical voice rights to demand the Village Government act responsibly is still relatively low. Experience during the New Order and reform eras shows that the *Musdes* and *Musrenbangdes* processes have still become the arena for village elites, which often creates *conflicts of interest* and benefits only a few groups. The practice of planning in villages to produce planning and budgeting documents such as *RPJMDesa*, *RKPDesa* and *APBDesa* has not changed much. Regular civic forums as the space for citizen participation have not been properly organized based on regulatory principles. The role of the *BPD* is still not optimal, because the dominance of the village head is still widely visible in the process.

In other words, citizen participation in regular civic forums also seems artificial, ceremonial, or a mere formality because it takes place without the "real" presence of various stakeholders during the strategic decision-making process. They are present, but have not been able to fight for their interests due to certain "limits and restrictions". In village planning and budgeting deliberations, for example, marginal groups were not involved or were deliberately not presented by the organizers (generally because they were considered unimportant or were represented by the elite). The village planning and budgeting stages are often dominated by village officials and elites. Currently, there are still many categories of residents who cannot be reached or have broad access to village development programs. They are vulnerable and marginalized groups of people, including children, women, elderly citizens, and of course people with special needs (*disabled*), so the impact of village development is not felt by these community groups at all.

This general complaint about the practice of accountability, transparency, and participation needs to be traced to its existence and dynamics in a specific context, as has been done by the researchers through this research, where one village in Dompu Regency, West Nusa Tenggara Province, namely Dorokobo Village, Kempo District, was positioned as the locus. The focus of the research was on the dynamics of implementing the Village Law with the background of the style, type, or behaviour of the Village Head leadership as the highest power holder, supporting or hindering the agenda of developing inclusive governance based on social justice in development management in the village as mandated by the Village Law.

METHOD

This study used the qualitative method with a case study approach. Qualitative research aims to uncover a variety of issues and seek answers to many questions by examining a range of

individual and community settings (Creswell, 2007, p.4). Observation, in-depth interviews, and document analysis were function as the main techniques of data collection. The subjects were selected based on the purposive sampling technique to determine the key informants as sources of research data, namely the number of village government officials and residents. They have chosen as informants based on their knowledge and interpretation of the dynamic of the implementation of the Village Law in the context of their village with the setting of the autocratic leadership style of the Village Head when carrying out his roles and duties in managing the village development.

This article is based on the findings of research conducted for three months (March-May 2018) in Dorokobo Village. This village has been established for 18 years since 2003 and is led by three Village Heads: the 2005-2011 period, the 2011-2017 period, and the 2017-2023 period. To limit the scope and focus of interest, this research will only present a discussion about the implementation dynamics of the Village Law with the background of the leadership style of the 2011-2017 Village Head (his name is Anas) who was accused of being autocratic by some informants. During his leadership, the position of village officials was filled by mostly Balinese immigrants. Of the six positions of Head of Affairs (*Kepala Urusan/Kaur*), four of them are occupied by residents from this category. In addition to the position of *Kaur*, the Village Head also appointed a resident of Balinese descent to the position of Village Treasurer (*Bendahara Desa*), who was the only functional woman in the Dorokobo Village Office. Thus, the political and administrative role of the people of Balinese descent is very strong because they are the main voters for the second term of the Village Head.

This research is dedicated to adding to the study of bad leadership style based on village contexts in Indonesia, as has been done previously by several parties who are concerned with village issues such as Mariana et. al. (2017) which explores aspects of leadership, the performance of representative institutions, and citizen initiatives in ten villages on the island of Java, including Ringinrejo Village, Wates District, Blitar Regency, East Java Province with a conservative-bureaucratic leadership style. In addition, Rahmad et. al (2019) explore the various "steep roads" of institutionalizing negotiable governance in development management in Bajo Village, Soromandi District, Bima Regency, West Nusa Tenggara Province.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Dorokobo Village: Its History and Recent Politics, Economics, and Social Conditions

Dorokobo Village is a lowland village with an area of 21.05 km² surrounded by rice and corn farms as the foundation of the local economy. The centre of the village is Dusun Dorokobo on the edge of the highway for about 2 km to the capital of Kempo and Pekat sub-districts. Besides Dorokobo Hamlet, two other hamlets are Darma Sari Hamlet and Nusa Sari Hamlet. Dorokobo Village is now 18 years old after it bloomed from Ta'a Village in 2003. According to the 2016 Kempo District Regional Statistics data, the population of Dorokobo Village is 1,412 people consisting of 722 men and 690 women. The 2016 Village Monograph data recorded that there were 383 households there. About two-thirds of the villagers are migrants from Bali who inhabit, in particular, the Nusa Sari and Darma Sari hamlets. They migrated in the late 1980s to early 1990s as the second generation of their parents who arrived earlier in the 1970s and live in other parts of the village in Dompu Regency. Approximately one-third of the population lives in Dorokobo Hamlet where most of them are residents of Bima blood and the rest are migrants from Bali.

In terms of livelihood, Dorokobo Village residents predominantly work as wetland farmers who plant rice and corn in turns every year. They also grow legumes such as green beans and soybeans. Corn is becoming widely planted as a trading commodity in line with the local government's program to promote Dompu as the National Corn Granary. In the last five to six years, the Dompu Regency Government has cleared unused land in the mountains to be utilized by farmers from all villages, including residents of Dorokobo Village, especially to produce corn. Most of the farmers also keep beef cattle in the cage at the back of the house, some farmers release the cows in the grazing fields in Pekat District which is tens of kilometres from their homes.

Farmers join farmer groups that support each other, especially in water management. Each group manages bore wells for agriculture, maintains infrastructure and pays fees for maintenance. In general, these farmer groups received information directly from the Department of Agriculture of the Dompu Regency regarding the availability of seed assistance, subsidized fertilizers, and farming capital.

The socio-cultural living conditions of Dorokobo Village show that immigrants of Balinese and Bima descent act in isolation from each other in the domain of organizing various social activities such as celebrations of life cycles and holidays. If a Bima resident dies, the Balinese do not mourn, and vice versa. When a Balinese married, the Bima people were not invited. Migrants from Bali take care of and develop their socio-cultural life prominently in the Nusa Sari and Darma Sari hamlets. They perform religious rituals at the 12 temples located in the two hamlets. During its 18 years of existence, Dorokobo Village has been led by as many as three Village Heads: the 2005-2011 Period, the 2011-2017 Period, and the 2017-2023 Period who were elected through the Village Head Election (*Pemilihan Kepala Desa/Pilkades*) in every six years.

Non-Democratic Nature of Political Leadership in Dorokobo Village: The Constraining Factor to Institutionalising an Inclusive Governance

Dorokobo Village has complicated socio-economic problems, thus requiring the presence of a responsive Village Government and active residents to jointly manage various development activities. Unfortunately, expectations of ideal leadership are not widely found in the structure of the Village Government for the 2011-2017 period. The Village Government was busy with various administrative activities and absent from substantive matters. Political leaders came with a normative-procedural and even autocratic-authoritarian style so that the participation spaces in terms of the regular civic forums were limited opened by only involving the village elite without the presence of all components of the community, especially marginal groups.

In addition, the *BPD* as a representative institution has not been able to work optimally for the aggregation and articulation of the interests of the represented citizens. Similar to the performance of the Village Government, the concentration of the *BPD* tends to lead to procedural works such as facilitating the implementation of Village Deliberations and the preparation of Village regulations. As a result, the voices of the residents do not have an effective communication-interaction channel with the Village Government to convey certain needs that have so far escaped the attention of power holders in the village.

The way leaders carry out their roles and responsibilities, which is commonly termed as leadership style, in the context of the development management of Dorokobo Village, as shown especially by the figure of the Village Head in the 2011-2017 period, tends to lead to autocratic leadership behaviour.

Addition to autocratic, authoritarian, immoral, abusive, non-democratic, tyrannical, destructive, defective, toxic, narcissistic, evil, and the like are terms that describe the nature of bad leadership. Autocratic and authoritarian styles will be used interchangeably in the narrative of this article. To note, the autocratic leader was described as overcontrolling work and overemphasizing task accomplishment (Hendrix & McNichols, 1982) and wherein the leader was instructed to give orders, never accept suggestions uncritically, and, in general, make it clear that he was the boss (Shaw, 1955). This kind of leadership style has several prominent characteristics, namely low agreeableness; high neuroticism, narcissism, and psychopathy; the need for power; and also task-oriented. autocratic leadership is more likely to be reflective of the desire of authoritarian subordinates for strong leaders (Harms, Wood, Landy, Lester, & Lester, 2018).

Leaders that utilize the authoritarian style are particularly focused on control. To keep and maintain control, an authoritarian leader is quick to confirm the status quo by emphasizing hierarchical differences between the supervisor and subordinate; this is often accomplished through definitional reminders and the forced use of titles. An authoritarian leader's desire to establish and maintain control is a likely precursor to him or her utilizing abusive supervisory strategies (Aryee, Chen, Sun, & Debrah, 2007). These abusive tendencies include threats and punishments to those lower in power (Likert, 1961), which leads to poor communication and decreased teamwork (Cole, 2004).

Authoritarian leaders' self-centred motives are often displayed by disregarding or discounting their subordinate's ideas or contributions (Aryee et al., 2007; Farh & Cheng, 2000). The authoritarian leadership style is often contrasted with the democratic style because of its incompatibility (Eagly & Johnson, 1990). Where authoritarian leaders use their power and position to maintain control of their subordinates, democratic leaders utilize their power and position to encourage the shared decision-making process with their subordinates (Bass, 2008). Democratic leaders are also called participatory leaders because of their encouragement of shared responsibilities and are characterized as having communication that is oriented toward shared responsibilities with subordinates (Mullins, 1999). They are individual political actors who can transcend self-interest (Wells, 2019, p.198), in which the substantive needs of the people become the priority of their performance, which is fought for its realization through political instruments.

This kind of characteristic is confirmed by several things: (1) the difficulty of finding the Village Head for an interview by the researchers. Even when one of the personnel picked him up at home to immediately come to the Village Office due to the presence of the team of Dompu Regency Regional Supervisory Agency (*Badan Pengawasan Daerah/Bawasda*), this political leader was not willing to attend and left it entirely to the Finance Affairs Head (*Kaur Keuangan*) to deal with the Bawasda team; (2) Neither to the Bawasda Team nor the researchers, the *Kaur Keuangan* could not explain the details of the development programs and the village budget, instead insisting that the matter was only known or was the dominating authority of the Village Head; (3) Difficulty in obtaining village planning and budgeting documents. Documents were obtained by the researchers after being asked every day and explained the importance of the existence of documents to determine the potential of the village; and (4) there are no information boards on village development—programs that will, have been, and/or are currently being carried out by the village government—which are displayed in strategic places such as the terraces of the Village Office or other public places.

When the researchers met several villagers, we found information about the lack of communication between the village government and residents, including some existing Village Community Institutions (*Lembaga Kemasyarakatan Desa/LKD*). During the first three years of the leadership of the Village Head, the government was intense in building good communication with the community, often visiting residents' homes to stay in touch and always attending their celebration activities. However, in the last three years, especially ahead of the Simultaneous Village Head Elections (*Pilkades Serentak*) in 2017, this political leader seems indifferent and does not like to greet residents who inhabit certain areas, especially Dorokobo hamlet. He seems very close to the immigrants of Balinese descent who inhabit the hamlets of Nusa Sari and Darma Sari, because they were his mainstay voters in the 2011 *Pilkades*, as mentioned above.

People of Bima descent are difficult to get along with, they were called many times through loudspeakers, but they never came to the location. In contrast to residents of Balinese descent, only by hitting the gong do they all come because indeed individuals who do not participate will be fined by the Bali Community. Bima's native friends talked more without action than migrants from Bali (interview with Mr Anas, Head of Dorokobo Village in the 2011-2017 Period, on March 11, 2018).

In the early days of his leadership, the *BPD* and *LKD* were utilized as strategic partners in the village development governance. However, in the last 3 years, the two types of village institutions no longer function normally in various village activities. In 2019, the *BPD* once asked the Village Head to hold a village government performance evaluation meeting but our request was not heeded at all. The village government then tends to work alone where all decisions are determined internally without involving the *BPD*, *LKD*, and elements of the community. The worse thing is the village head rarely goes to the office, so residents often ask the village head's wife for help to ask for her husband's autograph. The signed document or letter is then taken the next day (interview with Mr Amiruddin, Former Head of the *BPD*, on 21 April 2018).

This kind of leadership behaviour ultimately prompted Mr Amiruddin as Chairman of the *BPD* for the 2011-2017 period to resign from his position and was then replaced by Mr Tayeb who was appointed directly by the Village Head without going through any deliberation and any

certificate. Mr Tayeb himself complained that he was never involved in village activities during the leadership of the past village head (interview on 25 May 2018).

Another consequence of such an autocratic leadership style in Dorokobo Village is the limited freedom of residents to voice their needs and interests to the Village Government through regular civic forums. As a result, information about current and future development programs has never been publicly disclosed to residents. Even if there is the dissemination of information from the village government in the informal community event in certain months, it is only related to administrative or residential matters. In other words, village planning and budgeting data seem deliberately hidden and not disseminated to the public. The low access of residents makes them not get adequate information about village development programs, confusing understanding between individuals.

For example, the existence of a Village-Owned Enterprise (*Badan Usaha Milik Desa/BUMDesa*) which was established in 2006 has never been communicated to the wider community. This *BUMDesa*, the savings and loan business unit, has gone bankrupt and is no longer operating after two years of being found because the loan problem was not returned by the borrowers. The Director of *BUMDesa* then runs a fertilizer trading business under the company name "*UD BUMDesa*". This village used to have the *BUMDesa*. Savings and loans units and there were profits gained by it. But somehow now there is no *BUMDesa* anymore, instead, the Director of the *BUMDesa* owns the business. We don't know how it can be like that (interview with Mr Kamaludin, Head of the *LPM*, on 27 March 2018).

This sad story shows how information about village activities is reluctant to be communicated openly. Weak and authoritarian leadership is one of the contributing factors. Role-playing behaviour, as shown by Dorokobo Village Head for the 2011-2017 period, is a manifestation of the *Old Style Leadership Paradigm* which is 'personal power to control and be served', not the *New Paradigm*, namely the leader who 'empower others, influence and serve others' (Joshi, 2019, p.142). Likewise, authoritative political leadership is a military-like type of leadership that sets a direction by giving a command-like lead, which the recipients of the lead obey because they are inspired by this leadership or simply because obedience is obligatory and/or coerced (Brooker, 2010, p.3).

Stakeholder Exclusion-Inclusion in "Invited Spaces of Participation" on Village Planning and Other Development Stages

The presentation and discussion of research data in this section revolve around the portrait of citizen participation in regular civic forums and relations between actors in village development management which were strongly influenced by the autocratic leadership style of Dorokobo Village Head for the 2011-2017 Period. Regular civic forums which are held annually in the context of village planning and budgeting are a group of political public spaces as manifestations of village-scale deliberative democracy. This is one of the primary contents of the Village Law which requires the full participation of citizens in it to make decisions or determine policies that are related to their collective interests. To eliminate the characteristics of elitist democracy, the public decision-making space at the village level must be fully politicized through expanding access to the participation of non-elite citizens.

In other words, the politicization of public space for the establishment of an open and accountable village government, as mandated by the Village Law, requires the full participation of citizens in any decision-making forum that takes place in the village. Planning and implementation of village development must involve all components of the community without exception based on the spirit of *gotong-royong* and guarantee the granting of their constitutional rights to monitor and supervise the course of development because their involvement is one of the keys to successful village development, which is manifested in the use of the right to express opinions in every village development planning deliberations and full access and control over the local resources.

Constitutionally, the citizens' participation spaces in the village development planning stage are at the moment of preparation or discussion of the *RPJMDesa* and *RKPDesa*, as presented in the following table:

Table 1. The citizens' participation spaces in the village development planning stage

Documents	Activities	Descriptions
<i>RPJMDesa</i>	Hamlet Deliberation (<i>Musdus</i>)	Organized by each hamlet head by involving all residents in the hamlet.
	Village Deliberation (<i>Musdes</i>): Development of Village Development Plans	Organized by the BPD involving the <i>RPJMDesa</i> Drafting Team and the village community.
	Village Development Planning Meeting (<i>Musrenbangdes</i>)	Organized by the Village Head, which is attended by village officials, the BPD, and residents.
<i>RKPDesa</i>	Village Deliberation (<i>Musdes</i>): Development of Village Development Plans	Organized by the BPD involving the <i>RKPDesa</i> Drafting Team and the village community.
	Village Development Planning Meeting (<i>Musrenbangdes</i>)	Organized by the Village Head, which is attended by village officials, the BPD, and residents.

Source: processed by researchers

The politicization of the public sphere means the removal of restrictive barriers for villagers to engage in regular civic forums. If the restriction is still maintained, then it is a form of depoliticization. The undeveloped political relationship between the state and the autonomous people is the core of the concept of depoliticizing public space (Tornquist, 2009, p.1). Depoliticization reflects the process of removing the political character of decision-making or the creation of a theoretically free decision-making arena from political pressure through the application of a rule-based system that significantly removes or reduces the discretion of politicians and the public (Flinders & Buller, 2005, p.4).

Referring to the context of Dorokobo Village, the restriction of public space is still maintained as one of the "real defects" in the process of democratizing village life. The practice of village democratization, as the main agenda of the Village Law, continues to experience a complex deficit because the opening of public space in the decision-making domain is still fictitious in which the invited community elements, outside the Village Government and the *BPD*, are only focused on the leaders of the Village Community Institution (*LKD*), such as *Rukun Warga* and *Rukun Tetangga*. Not all *LKD* officials are invited to participate in regular civic forums.

In the area of the *RKPDesa Musrenbangdes* which is held annually, the *Lembaga Pemberdayaan Masyarakat/LPM*, for example, always escapes forum participation invitations and accuses the Village Government of never communicating this to other institutions, which consequently makes the *LPM* not optimally perform its duties, including in the village planning and budgeting stages. The village government must discuss development issues with its citizens, especially planning, budgeting, and implementing the village development programs. Various institutions at the village level must discuss strategic matters that are closely related to the management of village development. The *LPM* as one of the *LKD* in this village has never been invited and involved in any forum regarding development planning and budgeting (interview with Mr Ahmad, Head of the *LPM*, on 27 March 2018).

During the leadership of the Village Head for the 2011-2017 period, even the *LPM* was not invited to be involved in the *RKPDesa Musrenbangdes* forum, so its leader practically never knew the details of village development programs, such as plans for making alley rebates in certain *Rukun Tetangga* areas by the Village Government in 2017. The absence of this kind of two-way communication raises questions here and there, in the minds of some village elites and residents alike, because of the confusion of information that is spread to the public, received in pieces, and disseminated by word of mouth without sufficient elements of its validity.

If there is a program using ADD funds, the Village Government must consult with community leaders, *BPD*, *LKD*, and various elements of the community. It is important for village democratization, but this mechanism is rarely implemented. In my opinion, inter-agency

partnerships sometimes appear and disappear. There are things we need to know and conversely, this kind of fact is confusing (interview with Mr Ahmad, Head of the *LPM*, on 27 March 2018).

The description above shows that the development planning meetings tend to be carried out ceremonially. Village planning through regular civic forums is only dominated by the elites, especially the village government and village officials so information about village planning policies cannot be known by the wider community. Information boards at the Village Office are not managed properly due to the lack of publication of village development data. And the dissemination of these matters was also missed through "informal" village community activities such as community celebrations which could be used as additional space to spread the information they needed to know.

Meanwhile, at the village budgeting stage, it was found that this area was very much controlled by the Village Head, referring to the speeches of village officials met, when asked about the number of funds for physical activities and/or other kinds, they always said "We don't know it all. The village head does." The village head's closedness regarding budgeting information makes residents question, speculate, and accuse without knowing what the truth is. The village officials also did not understand the usage of village funds like most common people. If we ask about it, none of them knows the answer. We were even asked to ask this directly to the village head. The Village Secretary also doesn't know, almost all of the apparatus doesn't understand, and only the Village Head controls the information (interview with Mr Tayeb, Recent Head of the *BPD*, on May 25, 2018).

As found in the village planning stage, the *BPD*, *LPM*, village officials, and residents have never received a copy of the *APBDesa*. The *APBDesa* document is completely closed to the community and is only in the hands of the Village Head. They do not know how much the budget is for certain physical development programs, for example, making gang rebates. Whether or not there is planning and budgeting for making alley rebates in the *RKPDesa* or *APBDesa*, as an example, we don't understand at all. Soon the alley rebates have been completed (Interview with Mr Tayeb, Recent Head of the *BPD*, on May 25, 2018)

The stage of implementing village activities that have been planned and budgeted in advance has also raised questions from the community. The limited information about village planning obtained by residents has an impact on the uncertainty of the activities carried out. The Activity Implementation Team (*Tim Pelaksana Kegiatan/TPK*) for the village government and some people are identified as "contractors". The person appointed as a "contractor" is a village apparatus or other party directly determined by the Village Government. The project for constructing a farm road in the area where I live is nothing other than being carried out or bought up by one of the village officials. He manages the purchase of materials and directs and pays the people who work. The workers are residents who live around the project site (interview with Mrs Suryanti, the *Posyandu* Cadre in Dorokobo Village, on 15 May 2018).

Several residents also said that in 2016 there was an activity to build a fence and parking lot for the Village Office, the one who got a "wholesale" was the Head of the Darma Sari hamlet. When this was confirmed personally, he revealed that "The one who was given a wholesale job by the village government for the work on the fence and parking lot for the village office was indeed me, with a budget of twenty million rupiahs, but the materials needed for the work had been prepared in advance by the village government, When the work was completed, I was given a salary of seven and a half million rupiah, withholding taxes of about two million rupiahs, net income of five and a half million rupiah. Then I divided the money among three people who helped me, namely my younger brother and two of my children (interview with Mr Wayan Sudarman, Head of Darma Sari Hamlet, on 17 May 2018).

From the description above, it shows that the implementation of development is left to certain figures who have a personal affinity with the Village Head. This appointed person then carries out infrastructure work, as happened in the process of road construction as well as making fences and parking lots for the Village Office. If in the Dorokobo Hamlet the "contractor" was a friend of the Village Head, in the Nusa Sari Hamlet it was Ketut Karna (a member of the *BPD*), and construction at the Village Office was managed by Wayan Sudarma (Head of the Darma Sari

Hamlet). This spread to the understanding of residents who said that infrastructure development was not transparently done more development program was carried out in Nusa Sari and Darma Sari hamlets than in Dorokobo hamlet. The village authorities and project implementers did not make information boards about the types of infrastructure development, costs, and sources of funds.

The development evaluation stage has also not been carried out properly. There is a 2016 *APBDesa* Realization Report document, but it is still in the form of a raw draft, some of which are not following the *RKPDesa* and *APBDesa* documents. Evaluation of development is something that cannot be done because of the closedness of the village government, similar to the characteristics of managing other stages of development, namely development planning, budgeting, and implementation. The village government is less open to collaborating with the wider community, including community leaders and the *LKD* leaders.

In addition, information on village development activities has not been well-publicized. As a result, the villagers are in a state of minimal knowledge about it. When residents asked the Head of *LPM* and/or Head of *BPD*, they answered they didn't know because the Village Government had never responded well to all the questions that the two of them had asked their partners. Even when residents directly asked village officials, they often gave unsatisfactory answers and always said "...don't know... who knows it is the village head ...". The Village Head was difficult to find and rarely socialized even with the people of Dorokobo Hamlet where he lives (interview with Mr Anwar, the Head of *Karang Taruna* Institution, on 5 May 2018).

As a response to this autocratic leadership style in the village development management, there is hope for the realization of inclusive governance based on social justice in Dorokobo Village. In general, the community hopes that there will be a change in the attitude of all parties in encouraging information disclosure, including village planning and budgeting. Residents fully hope for the leadership of the Village Head who is open to the full involvement of elements outside the Village Government in village development governance. In the future whoever becomes the village head must be willing to open up and be willing to discuss strategic matters with the wider community (interview with Mr Amiruddin, Former Head of the *BPD*, on 21 April 2018).

Strengthening the village institutions is very much needed, especially knowledge about the substance of the Village Law which until now has not been fully understood by all parties. Even in this domain, complaints were found that institutional capacity strengthening activities within the framework of equalizing perceptions and responses to the substance of the Village Law, which are often facilitated by the above-level government (*Pemerintah Supra Desa*) have never been carried out by bringing together all elements of the Village Government, *BPD*, *LKD*, and representatives of residents at the same time and place. This kind of pattern must be corrected so that we can identify collectively the challenges and opportunities of Dorokobo Village development management referring to the availability of prospective village potentials (interview with Mr Tayeb, Head of the *BPD*, on 25 May 2018).

At the citizen level, they have received information through the national mass media, especially television, that the village budget is very large, can reach more than one billion rupiahs and must be supervised by the community regarding its use by the Village Government. However, the residents of Dorokobo Village do not yet understand the method or mechanism to carry out the escort.

In line with this expectation, true democracy must prioritize public deliberation, give full authority to all citizens to take the best actions for the realization of the public benefit, and foster a participatory decision-making process based on these principles (Pettit, 2004, p.52). This is the spirit of the Village Law in which deliberative democracy, participatory governance, inclusive democracy, negotiable governance, and other similar terminology can function as the core characteristics of village development management.

The Village Law, nothing else, requires the implementation of inclusive governance in the management of village development. Authority in this area becomes a negotiation space for various stakeholders. Therefore, the village government must always ensure full accessibility of citizens to get involved in regular civic forums that take place every year in the village to determine policies that are related to their collective interests. Elite democracy can be eliminated

through the politicization of public space in the form of expanding access to the participation of non-elite citizens in the public decision-making space at the village level.

The spirit of the Village Law leads to the functionalization of deliberative democracy, participatory governance, inclusive democracy, negotiable governance, and other similar terminology as the core characteristics of village development management. Increasing the level and scope of citizen participation at all stages of village development must become a new spirit that must be applied for the sake of attaching the predicate "inclusive and participatory" in the management of village development. This is important to do to eliminate the existence of the bad legacy of the New Order where the practice of public participation only takes place in a formal-ceremonial manner without providing more access for residents who attend regular civic forums to communicate and fight for their interests in the Village Government and the BPD. The Village Law exists as an answer to the urge and the need to develop democratic life in the village. It is an integral part of the reform agenda which manifests itself in the form of perfecting regulations that are accommodating to the idea of a bottom-up pattern of development for the sake of advancing the standard of living of the village. The embodiment of democracy that prospers in the village will be in the straightway when the domain of village development management has transformed into a field of contestation of interests, between active citizens and open village government. The accountability of authoritative power holders is closely related to their willingness to open access to public participation in any strategic policy-making forum that takes place in the village. Eliminating barriers to participation as a reflection of the politicization of public space is a primary prerequisite for the creation of substantive democracy oriented towards justice and social welfare in the village.

CONCLUSION

The context of Dorokobo Village presents the fact that the autocratic leadership style that results in the exclusion of citizens from participating in all stages of the village development management is an obstacle to the realization of inclusive governance based on social justice. The limited access to information as well as the lack of communication media variants for disseminating development data to the public reflects the reluctance and unpreparedness of the village government to sow the principles of transparency and accountability in managing the village development. The village government tends to be willing to provide information only to certain people, not disseminated to the general public in the village as a manifestation of its constitutional obligations. It does not yet have the political will to expand public space to discuss and make collective decisions on strategic aspects of the village development governance. The availability of access to information is still very limited and depends on the willingness of the village government (especially the village head) to provide it to all existing residents. Certain information can only be accessed by people who have the closest relationship with certain village officials, not villagers in general. Communication media is still limited to existing formal forums such as the Village Development Planning Deliberation which is believed to remain exclusive because it only involves certain elements of the community, which may not represent the needs of all community groups.

REFERENCES

- Agarwal, R. (2008). *Teaching for social justice: an ambiguous and uncertain endeavour*. Dissertation. Columbia: Columbia University.
- Aryee, S., Chen, Z. X., Sun, L.Y. & Debrah, Y. A. (2007). Antecedents and outcomes of abusive supervision: Test of a trickle-down model. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*, 191-201. doi:10.1037/0021-9010.92.1.191

- Bass, B. M. (2008). *Bass and Stogdill's handbook of leadership: theory, research and managerial applications* (4th Ed.). New York, NY: Free Press.
- Bee, C. (2017). *Active citizenship in Europe: practices and demands in the EU, Italy, Turkey and the UK*. London: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Brooker, P. (2010). *Leadership in democracy*. 2nd Edition. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Carothers, T. & Brechenmacher, S. (2014). Closing space: democracy and human rights support under fire. *Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, Washington, DC*. Retrieved from https://carnegieendowment.org/files/closing_space.pdf.
- Cole, N. D. (2004). Gender differences in perceived disciplinary fairness. *Gender, Work & Organization*, 11, 254-277. doi:10.1111/j.1468-0432.2004.00231.x
- Cornwall, A. (2004a). New democratic spaces? the politics and dynamics of institutionalised participation. *IDS Bulletin*, 2, 1-10.
- Creswell, J. W. (2007). *Qualitative inquiry and research design: choosing among five approaches*. Second Edition. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Eagly, A. H., & Johnson, B. T. (1990). Gender and leadership style: a meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 108, 233-256. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.108.2.233
- Farh, J. L., & Cheng, B. S. (2000). A cultural analysis of paternalistic leadership in Chinese organizations. In J. T. Li, A. S. Tsui, & E. Weldon (Eds.), *Management and organizations in the Chinese context* (pp. 94-129). London, England: MacMillan.
- Flinders, M. & Buller, J. (2005). *Depoliticisation, democracy, and arena-shifting*. Paper. Stanford: Stanford University.
- Gaventa, J. & Barrett, G. (2010). So what difference does it make? mapping the outcomes of citizen engagement. IDS Working Paper, No. 347, Institute of Development Studies at the University of Sussex, Brighton. Retrieved from https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1111/j.2040-0209.2010.00347_2.x
- Grindle, M. (2010). *Good governance: the inflation of an idea*. Retrieved from <https://dash.harvard.edu/handle/1/4448993>.
- Harms, P. D., Wood, D., Landay, K., Lester, P. B., & Lester, G. V. (2018). Autocratic leaders and authoritarian followers revisited: a review and agenda for the future. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 29(1), 105-122. <https://doi-org.ezproxy.ugm.ac.id/10.1016/j.leaqua.2017.12.007>
- Hendrix, W. H., & McNichols, C. W. (1982). Organizational effectiveness is a function of managerial style, situational environment, and effectiveness criterion. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 52, 145-151.
- Hickey, S. (2015). Inclusive institutions. *GSDRC Professional Development Reading Pack, No. 29, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, UK*. Retrieved from https://gsdrc.org/wp-content/uploads/2015/12/Inclusive-Institutions_RP.pdf.
- Hidayat, R., Hendra, & Iptidaiyah, M. (2019). The steep road to institutionalizing negotiable governance in the management of village development. *Journal of Governance: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan Universitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa*, 4(1), 45-67.
- Joshi, B. S. (2019). Leadership style paradigm shift in hospital industry: need of the day, in comparison with the hospitality industry. *Journal of Health Management*, 21(1), 141-153. doi: 10.1177/0972063418822195
- Law No. 6/2014 on Village (*UU Desa*).
- Likert, R. (1961). *New patterns of management*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Mariana, D. et al. (2017). *Desa: situs baru demokrasi lokal*. Yogyakarta: IRE.
- Mitlin, D. (2004). Reshaping local democracy: Editorial. *Environment & Urbanization*, 16(1), 3-8.
- Mullins, L. J. (1999). *Management and organizational behaviour*. London, England: Financial Times.
- OECD. (2020). What does "inclusive governance" mean? clarifying theory and practice. *OECD Development Policy Papers*, March 2020, No. 27.
- Permendesa PDPTT Republik Indonesia Nomor 1 Tahun 2015 tentang *Pedoman kewenangan berdasarkan hak asal-usul dan kewenangan lokal berskala desa*.
- Pettit, P. (2004). Depoliticizing democracy. *Ratio Juris*, 17(1), 52-65.

- Priyono, A. E. (2017). Demokratisasi desa: situs baru politik partisipatoris? In Mariana, D. et al., *Desa: situs baru demokrasi lokal* (pp. 1-11). Yogyakarta: IRE.
- Reason, D., & Davis, T. (2005). Antecedents, precursors, and concurrent concepts in the development of social justice attitudes and actions. *New Directions for Student Services, 110*, 5-15.
- Rocha Menocal, A. (2012). Analysing the relationship between democracy and development. *Commonwealth Governance for Development, Cambridge, UK*. Retrieved from <http://www.commonwealthgovernance.org/assets/uploads/2014/04/GG11-Analysing-the-relationship-between-democracy-and-development.pdf>.
- Shaw, M. E. (1955). A comparison of two types of leadership in various communication networks. *Sociometry, 37*, 38-53.
- Thompson, L., & Tapscott, C. (2010). *Citizenship and social movements: perspectives from the global south*. London & New York: Zed Books.
- Tornquist, O. (2009). Introduction: the problem is representation! towards an analytical framework. In O. Tornquist, N. Webster, & K. Stokke (Eds.), *Rethinking popular representation* (pp. 1-23). Houndmills: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Weil, M. (2004). Introduction: contexts and challenges for 21st-century communities. In M. Weil (Ed.), *Handbook of community practice* (30-33). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Wells, T. (2019) Narrative and elucidating the concept of democracy: the case of Myanmar's activists and democratic leaders. *Democratization, 26*(2), 190-207, doi: 10.1080/13510347.2018.1509850