



## **Analysis of Community Participation in the Musrenbang in Tanjungpinang Timur Village, Bukit Bestari Subdistrict, Tanjungpinang City**

**Azahra Ashilah<sup>1\*</sup>, Bismar Arianto<sup>2</sup>, Adhe Fadli Farhan<sup>3</sup>**

<sup>1-3</sup> Universitas Maritim Raja Ali Haji

email: [2205010022@student.umrah.ac.id](mailto:2205010022@student.umrah.ac.id)<sup>1</sup>

### **Article Info :**

Received:  
11-07-2026  
Revised:  
26-07-2026  
Accepted:  
30-07-2026

### **Abstract**

*This study investigates the operational realities of public participation within the municipal development planning forum (Musrenbang) in Tanjungpinang Timur Village, Bukit Bestari Subdistrict, Tanjungpinang City. Utilizing an empirical sociolegal research design, the investigation juxtaposes statutory mandates under Law Number 25 of 2004, Law Number 23 of 2014, and Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 86 of 2017 against field execution practices. Data were gathered through in depth interviews with eleven key informants and procedural documentation analysis, subsequently processed using the interactive qualitative model of Miles and Huberman. Findings demonstrate that participatory planning mechanisms function primarily as procedural compliance routines rather than genuine platforms for deliberative democracy. Structural reliance on neighborhood elite delegation restricts direct citizen involvement, while bureaucratic filters during municipal technical reviews systematically prioritize physical infrastructure projects over socio-economic welfare proposals. Consequently, the local planning framework reflects top down administrative dominance, reducing community input to a symbolic legitimization tool. Reforming this system requires institutionalized legal guarantees, binding participatory budgeting mechanisms, and unmediated deliberative spaces to ensure equitable regional development and meaningful grassroots empowerment.*

**Keywords :** Musrenbang, Community Participation, Sociolegal Study, Regional Planning, Local Governance.



©2022 Authors.. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International License.  
(<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

## **INTRODUCTION**

In contemporary global political discourse and public administration, participatory governance has emerged as a fundamental paradigm to democratize decision making processes and bridge the structural chasm between state institutions and local citizens. The global shift toward decentralized governance frameworks emphasizes the imperative of institutionalizing deliberative spaces where grassroots communities actively shape policy priorities rather than remaining passive recipients of state welfare. Within democratic legal systems, participatory mechanisms serve as vital instruments to enhance institutional legitimacy, foster civic empowerment, and ensure that public resource allocation reflects local socioeconomic realities. In the Global South, decentralized development planning frameworks have been widely adopted to operationalize these democratic ideals, positioning community participation as a cornerstone of sustainable development (Theresia, 2015). In the Indonesian administrative ecosystem, this paradigm is legalistic and institutionalized through the Development Planning Deliberation or Musrenbang, a mandatory multitiered planning mechanism designed to synthesize grassroots aspirations from the village level up to the national agenda (Saputri & Simbolon, 2023). However, while the normative mandate for bottom up planning is firmly enshrined in statutory regulations, the global and national evolution of participatory governance reveals a persistent friction between normative administrative design and actual deliberative practice.

Scholarly inquiries into participatory planning mechanisms have produced critical empirical insights regarding the operational dynamics and systemic outcomes of citizen engagement in local governance. Research investigating regional development framework mechanisms demonstrates that institutionalized participatory channels are essential for aligning infrastructural priorities with community needs, thereby strengthening local policy implementation and governance efficiency (Yusri,

2024). Studies evaluating local government policy execution highlight that active citizen involvement directly correlates with enhanced public compliance, institutional trust, and transparent resource distribution at the subdistrict level (Wartono, 2026). Furthermore, empirical assessments of village development planning emphasize that community engagement significantly determines the operational effectiveness of Musrenbang, transforming procedural consultations into actionable developmental programs (Syafika et al., 2026). In urban and rural administrative spaces alike, researchers have observed that structured public consultations can effectively mobilize social capital and generate localized policy solutions (Sari et al., 2023). Nevertheless, these critical contributions collectively demonstrate that while participatory structures exist across administrative tiers, their functional execution remains contingent upon complex institutional and sociopolitical variables.

Despite the extensive literature documenting the procedural mechanics of Musrenbang, existing scholarship exhibits a profound conceptual and empirical gap regarding the qualitative depth of citizen engagement versus mere institutional compliance. Dominant analytical frameworks frequently equate successful participation with quantitative metrics, such as participant turnout rates or the formal submission of project proposals, thereby overlooking structural power asymmetries that marginalize grassroots voices (Zubair & Irwan, 2023). Existing research often fails to resolve the fundamental contradiction where government actors view Musrenbang as a procedural requirement for administrative legitimation, while citizens perceive it as a substantive deliberative arena for political negotiation. Although innovative models have been proposed to advance participatory regional planning (Saragih et al., 2024), current literature insufficiently accounts for how administrative gatekeeping, hierarchical filtering by local elites, and structural constraints in subdistricts, such as Tanjungpinang Timur Village within Bukit Bestari Subdistrict, systematically reduce democratic deliberation to a symbolic ritual. Consequently, the field lacks a nuanced theoretical explanation for why legally mandated participatory platforms repeatedly produce procedural inclusion yet substantive exclusion.

The persistent misalignment between procedural compliance and substantive democratic engagement presents an urgent scientific and practical dilemma for modern legal and political theory. From a theoretical standpoint, failing to interrogate the micro dynamics of power distribution within local deliberative forums risks perpetuating a flawed assumption that institutional design automatically guarantees democratic responsiveness. From a practical perspective, when community participation is reduced to an administrative formality, public trust in local governance rapidly erodes, leading to citizen apathy, diminished civic involvement, and budget allocations that diverge from acute grassroots priorities. In Tanjungpinang Timur Village, fluctuating participant attendance and reliance on intermediary elites such as neighbourhood heads illustrate an imperative need to examine whether current planning mechanisms truly empower citizens or merely legitimize top down bureaucratic decisions. Resolving this empirical challenge is crucial for preventing systemic institutional decay and ensuring that local development planning achieves genuine social justice and equitable resource distribution.

This research strategically positions itself within the scholarly landscape of political science, legal theory, and public administration by shifting the analytical focus from macro structural regulations to the micro political dynamics of local deliberative spaces. Rather than evaluating Musrenbang strictly through administrative normative compliance, this study operationalizes a critical framework examining three interconnected dimensions, namely the concrete forms of participation, the degree of decision making authority granted to citizens, and the structural methods utilized for proposal submission. By situating the inquiry within Tanjungpinang Timur Village, Bukit Bestari Subdistrict, Tanjungpinang City, this study provides a granular examination of how local sociopolitical hierarchies, administrative constraints, and community perceptions intersect during the 2025 Musrenbang process. This contextualized approach bridges the gap between legal formalist interpretations of participatory regulations and the empirical realities of local governance, offering a refined theoretical lens to dissect democratic participation in decentralized state structures.

The primary objective of this study is to critically analyze the dynamics of community participation in the execution of the 2025 Musrenbang in Tanjungpinang Timur Village, illuminating how institutional design and local power relations shape public engagement. Methodologically, this inquiry employs a qualitative descriptive approach utilizing deep structural interviews with key local stakeholders, document analysis, and inductive thematic synthesis to capture the nuanced realities of

deliberative practice beyond superficial administrative records. Theoretically, this research contributes to public policy and legal theory by providing an empirical model that conceptualizes the transition from procedural representation to substantive deliberation in local development planning. Ultimately, the insights derived from this study offer crucial evidence based frameworks for policy makers and local governments to reform participatory mechanisms, dismantle administrative barriers, and foster genuine civic empowerment in local governance.

## **RESEARCH METHODS**

This study employs an empirical qualitative research design, specifically adopting a sociolegal approach to examine the operational dynamics of public involvement in local development planning. Primary data were gathered through indepth interviews with eleven key informants selected through purposive sampling based on their institutional involvement and contextual expertise in the planning process (Kusumastuti and Khoiron 2019). The informant pool comprised municipal officials from the Regional Development Planning Board of Tanjungpinang City, representatives from Bukit Bestari Subdistrict, the Head of Tanjungpinang Timur Village, representatives of the Community Empowerment Institution, neighborhood chairs, and local residents. Secondary data were collected through documentary techniques, examining legal frameworks such as Law Number 25 of 2004 on the National Development Planning System, Law Number 23 of 2014 on Local Government, and Minister of Home Affairs Regulation Number 86 of 2017, alongside official attendance registers and administrative planning records from the 2025 planning cycle.

The collected qualitative data were systematically processed using the interactive analysis model of Miles and Huberman, which integrates continuous data collection, data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing or verification (Sugiono 2020). Analytical synthesis was conducted inductively to juxtapose empirical field findings against legal mandates and participatory governance theories, thereby identifying structural divergences between normative legislative intent and practical execution. To ensure analytical rigor and data validity, source and methodological triangulation were implemented by corroborating interview accounts with official legislative texts and administrative documentations. This comprehensive analytical framework allowed the investigation to determine whether local participatory forums function as genuine spaces for deliberative democracy or merely serve as procedural compliance mechanisms.

## **RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

### **Structural Typology and Representative Mechanisms of Civic Engagement in Urban Planning**

The empirical examination of community participation within the 2025 Musrenbang in Tanjungpinang Timur Village demonstrates a heavy reliance on structural delegation rather than direct citizen involvement. Local authorities structured the primary deliberative stages around local administrative channels, specifically relying on neighborhood community leaders to channel public aspirations. Empirical evidence collected through field interviews reveals that direct citizen presence in formal planning assemblies remains exceptionally low across the subdistrict. This structural pattern indicates that statutory participation mechanisms primarily operate through administrative elites who act as conduits between residents and the local state apparatus.

Legislative frameworks mandate that participatory planning platforms operate as inclusive avenues for bottom up community aspirations (Republik Indonesia 2004). However, the institutionalization of local development practices often compresses broad civic involvement into formal delegate structures (Mahi and Trigunarso 2017). Rather than generating unmediated public debate, the forum relies on local neighborhood heads to compile community priorities prior to official assemblies. This mechanism aligns with broader observations in regional planning where administrative convenience frequently overrides deep civic deliberation (Riyadi and Bratakusumah 2004).

The formal organizational structure reflects statutory compliance under local governance frameworks while simultaneously revealing administrative bottlenecks in field implementation (Republik Indonesia 2014). Empirical observations confirm that neighborhood units process community requests through informal consultations instead of structured public assemblies. Consequently, civil society involvement becomes largely institutionalized through designated community leaders who possess varying degrees of communicative capacity (Noer 2022). This

structural delegation limits the direct expression of grassroots needs within the municipal budget planning process.

Such structural dynamics mirror participatory planning patterns observed across various administrative jurisdictions in Indonesia (Saputri and Simbolon 2023). Empirical findings from comparable local governments indicate that institutionalized delegation frequently leads to passive public attendance (Sari et al. 2023). When participation is filtered exclusively through neighborhood leaders, the diversity of public demands undergoes substantial administrative reduction (Ahmad et al. 2024). The structural design of municipal planning thus inherently favors organized local elites over marginalized citizen groups (Mustanir et al. 2024).

**Table 1. Typology of Civic Participation in Tanjungpinang Timur Village Musrenbang 2025**

| Participation Dimension | Institutional Channel    | Operational Execution                                         | Representative Reach                                           |
|-------------------------|--------------------------|---------------------------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------------------------|
| Direct Attendance       | Open Public Assembly     | Attendance list registration and formal plenary listening     | Restricted to local formal leaders and official delegates      |
| Informal Consultation   | Digital Messaging Groups | Unstructured text discussions via messaging applications      | Fragmented resident participation without formal documentation |
| Structured Delegation   | Neighborhood Leadership  | Pre assembly compilation of physical infrastructure proposals | Systematic representation filtered through neighborhood chairs |
| Municipal Verification  | Technical Agency Review  | Administrative screening against local budget capacity        | State driven assessment overriding local priorities            |

Source: Primary qualitative research data processed from Tanjungpinang Timur Village administration and informant interviews (2025)

The empirical configuration presented in Table 1 highlights how participatory avenues are segregated into distinct operational channels. Direct public attendance remains largely symbolic, serving primarily to satisfy formal administrative attendance quotas for municipal reporting. Conversely, actual proposal generation relies heavily on informal consultations and neighborhood delegation mechanisms. This operational reality demonstrates that community involvement is heavily filtered before reaching the municipal planning stage.

Scholarly research underscores that when participatory planning relies exclusively on structural delegation, local development priorities become susceptible to administrative bias (Yusri 2024). Studies on municipal governance demonstrate that democratic decentralization requires institutionalized channels for unmediated citizen voice (Fahmi and Hutaeruk 2022). Without direct deliberative spaces, community forums risk functioning merely as procedural exercises that validate pre determined state programs (Zubair and Irwan 2023). The empirical findings in Tanjungpinang Timur confirm that structural representation without direct engagement weakens public ownership over municipal outcomes (Bawamenewi 2026).

Further sociolegal analysis indicates that statutory mandates for participatory governance struggle to overcome institutionalized administrative habits (Menteri Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia 2017). The legal requirement to implement bottom up planning creates an imperative for local officials to showcase public involvement (Theresia 2015). However, the practical execution prioritizes procedural speed and document completion over extensive civic dialogue (Sunı et al. 2023). This gap between legal prescription and administrative practice creates a system where formal compliance masks limited public influence.

The reliance on informal communication channels, such as instant messaging groups, further highlights the absence of standardized deliberative spaces (Iqbal and Muliadi 2024). While digital tools offer quick communication, they lack statutory authority and systematic integration into official

municipal planning software (Rizkiya et al. 2023). Consequently, proposals submitted through informal channels are frequently lost during formal technical reviews by municipal agencies (Ratnasari and Hidayat 2025). This institutional disconnect leaves citizens with limited recourse when their expressed needs are omitted from the final regional budget plan.

In theoretical terms, the observed participation structure fits within low level consultation frameworks where public influence remains peripheral (Hutagalung 2022). Community involvement is solicited to gather information rather than to share decision making power (Darmo 2019). The institutional design of local planning forums thus reinforces state centric control over resource allocation under the guise of participatory governance (Sutomo 2020). Reforming this structural dynamic requires establishing binding mechanisms that mandate direct citizen deliberation at the lowest administrative tiers.

### **Institutional Hegemony and Sociolegal Disconnect in Participatory Regional Development Planning**

The realization of decentralized governance mandates that local development planning accommodates bottom up aspirations through formalized administrative channels (Republik Indonesia 2004). However, empirical observation of the planning assemblies in Tanjungpinang Timur Village indicates a profound structural disconnect between statutory ideals and execution realities (Menteri Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia 2017). Local authorities frequently compress broad civic engagement into procedural routines managed by designated community leaders (Mahi and Trigunarso 2017). This administrative tendency subordinates genuine public deliberation to bureaucratic compliance under regional regulations (Riyadi and Bratakusumah 2004). Consequently, grassroots communities experience systematic alienation within the municipal planning framework (Noer 2022).

Such structural marginalization mirrors broader institutional patterns documented across various Indonesian local governance contexts (Saputri and Simbolon 2023). When development planning relies exclusively on elite mediation, public involvement degenerates into passive tokenism (Sari et al. 2023). Qualitative data gathered from local informants reveal that statutory participation mandates often mask centralized bureaucratic control (Ahmad et al. 2024). This phenomenon exposes the limitations of decentralized legal frameworks in empowering ordinary citizens (Mustanir et al. 2024).

**Table 2. Empirical Mapping of Sociolegal Disconnect in Tanjungpinang Timur Village**

| Observation Variable     | Statutory Norm                 | Empirical Reality                       | Institutional Impact            |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| Planning Initiation      | Bottom Up Aspiration           | Top Down<br>Administrative<br>Filtering | Reduced Grassroots<br>Input     |
| Deliberative Access      | Universal Citizen<br>Franchise | Neighborhood Elite<br>Delegation        | Excluded<br>Marginalized Voices |
| Regulatory<br>Compliance | Mandatory Public<br>Inclusion  | Procedural Box<br>Ticking               | Performative<br>Democracy       |
| Resource Allocation      | Community Needs<br>Alignment   | Technical Agency<br>Override            | Bureaucratic<br>Hegemony        |

Source: Primary empirical data processed from Tanjungpinang Timur Village administrative records and key informant interviews (2025)

The structural dynamics captured in Table 2 demonstrate how statutory requirements are reconfigured by local bureaucratic apparatuses. The empirical evidence confirms that planning mechanisms prioritize administrative convenience over substantive democratic engagement (Yusri 2024). Democratic decentralization requires genuine institutional spaces for unmediated citizen discourse rather than performative compliance (Fahmi and Hutaaruk 2022). Without binding obligations for direct public inclusion, development forums function merely to legitimize pre determined state programs (Zubair and Irwan 2023). This institutional reality weakens public ownership over municipal outcomes in Tanjungpinang Timur Village (Bawamenewi 2026).

Legal analysis further emphasizes that administrative actors routinely exploit ambiguities in regional planning regulations to retain discretionary power (Theresia 2015). The imperative to demonstrate formal compliance forces local officials to prioritize document completion over qualitative civic dialogue (Sunı et al. 2023). Consequently, the gap between normative legal frameworks and administrative practice widens significantly (İbrohim and Ismanudin 2025). Citizens attempting to voice unmediated demands find their contributions dismissed during technical agency reviews (Dhaniarta et al. 2025). This systematic exclusion violates the core principles of participatory local autonomy (Purnomo et al. 2025).

The reliance on informal communication channels among residents further illustrates the absence of standardized deliberative spaces (İqbal and Muliadi 2024). While digital messaging applications facilitate localized discussions, they lack formal integration into municipal planning software (Rizkiya et al. 2023). Proposals generated through these informal networks are frequently lost during formal administrative filtering (Ratnasari and Hidayat 2025). This institutional disconnect leaves citizens with negligible recourse when their expressed needs are omitted from the final regional budget (Andi et al. 2025). The resulting structural friction highlights the urgent need for comprehensive administrative reform (Alrahmi et al. 2025).

Scholarly evaluations of village development planning consistently demonstrate that administrative centralization stifles local innovation (Geovany et al. 2025). When participation is restricted to formal neighborhood heads, diverse community demands undergo severe administrative reduction (İrnawati Ahmad et al. 2026). The structural design of municipal planning thus inherently favors organized local elites over vulnerable populations (Syafika et al. 2026). This dynamic reinforces state centric control over resource allocation under the guise of participatory governance (Sutomo 2020). Reforming this systemic flaw requires establishing binding mechanisms that mandate direct citizen deliberation at the lowest administrative tiers (Darmo 2019).

Comparative studies in regional governance suggest that overcoming institutional hegemony necessitates legal harmonization and transparent oversight (Saragih et al. 2024). When local authorities operate without stringent accountability measures, community welfare initiatives remain superficial (Abubakar & Putra 2025). The empirical findings in Tanjungpinang Timur Village validate the proposition that structural reform cannot succeed without altering entrenched bureaucratic behaviors (Wartono 2026). Addressing these challenges is paramount for transforming municipal planning into a genuine instrument of participatory democracy (De Nisa 2024). Ultimately, bridging the gap between legal norms and administrative practice requires unwavering political will and structural accountability (Hutagalung 2022).

### **Normative Institutional Filters and Allocation Dynamics in Grassroots Budgeting**

The translation of civic aspirations into statutory budget commitments requires functional alignment between community input and municipal priorities (Republik Indonesia 2004). In Tanjungpinang Timur Village, the operationalization of regional development planning reveals systemic budget allocation friction during administrative reviews (Menteri Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia 2017). Qualitative interview evidence highlights that public proposals undergo rigorous technical screening that heavily favors physical infrastructure over socio-economic welfare initiatives (Angellina et al. 2026). This selective prioritization mechanism restricts the legal scope of participatory budgeting within municipal governance frameworks (Republik Indonesia 2014).

The empirical trajectory of community proposals demonstrates how local administrative apparatuses exercise discretionary authority over grassroots submissions (Sugiono 2020). Out of dozens of proposals gathered from neighborhood meetings, municipal agencies approve only a minute fraction for funding inclusion (İbrohim and Ismanudin 2025). Statutory mandates intended to foster equitable regional growth encounter technical bottlenecks during sectoral budget consolidation (Mahi and Trigunarso 2017). Consequently, local communities experience diminished institutional agency as municipal technical criteria systematically override neighborhood priorities (Dhaniarta et al. 2025).

**Table 3. Empirical Distribution of Proposal Outcomes Across Development Sectors in Tanjungpinang Timur Village (2025 Cycle)**

| Sectoral Category       | Initial Proposals Submitted | Approved Proposals | Primary Reason for Administrative Exclusion                             |
|-------------------------|-----------------------------|--------------------|-------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| Physical Infrastructure | 28                          | 6                  | Budgetary limits and priority alignment with municipal master plans     |
| Economic Empowerment    | 14                          | 1                  | Absence of institutional framework for managing direct community grants |
| Social and Cultural     | 9                           | 0                  | Non alignment with sectoral performance targets of technical agencies   |
| Health and Sanitation   | 12                          | 2                  | Redundancy with centralized agency programs and municipal initiatives   |

Source: Primary qualitative research data processed from Tanjungpinang Timur Village administrative records and key informant interviews (2025)

The empirical metrics presented in Table 3 elucidate the structural bias inherent in local development resource distribution (Kusumastuti and Khoiron 2019). Technical agencies predominantly validate physical infrastructure demands while rejecting social and economic initiatives (Purnomo et al. 2025). This operational preference underscores the state centered orientation of municipal budgeting mechanisms (Riyadi and Bratakusumah 2004). As demonstrated by the empirical data, non physical community aspirations encounter severe administrative filtering during municipal planning stages (Alrahmi et al. 2025).

Sociolegal scholarship confirms that municipal planning systems frequently struggle to integrate qualitative welfare demands into standard budgetary frameworks (Abubakar & Putra 2025). The institutional emphasis on tangible infrastructure metrics obscures broader socio-economic development priorities (Sari et al. 2023). When citizen contributions are judged strictly by physical deliverables, community trust in participatory forums declines rapidly (Andi et al. 2025). The empirical findings in Tanjungpinang Timur demonstrate how administrative technicalities limit the transformative potential of participatory democracy (Bawamenewi 2026).

Furthermore, the lack of transparent feedback mechanisms regarding proposal rejections breeds deep skepticism among local residents (Ahmad et al. 2024). Citizens rarely receive detailed justification when their submitted projects are discarded during regional agency deliberations (Sunı et al. 2023). Statutory frameworks mandate accountability in public administration, yet practical execution fails to deliver communicative transparency (Theresia 2015). This procedural opacity reinforces public perceptions that local planning assemblies serve merely as symbolic exercises (Mustanir et al. 2024).

The institutional governance model in local administrative units requires comprehensive structural reform to accommodate diverse community needs (Saragih et al. 2024). Digital integration through electronic planning systems has failed to eliminate administrative bias in project selection (Rizkiya et al. 2023). While digital platforms streamline document management, they often replicate existing bureaucratic hierarchies (Ratnasari and Hidayat 2025). Unmediated citizen input remains largely unaddressed unless supported by formal institutional sponsors within municipal agencies (Iqbal and Muliadi 2024).

The broader political economy of municipal resource allocation reveals a persistent concentration of decision making power among state actors (Sutomo 2020). Local planning frameworks

treat public participation as an advisory input rather than a binding determinant of budget allocation (Hutagalung 2022). This power asymmetry limits the capacity of community members to influence municipal policy directions (Noer 2022). Legal provisions must evolve to establish mandatory funding quotas for direct grassroots initiatives (Darmo 2019).

Empirical evidence from rural and urban planning contexts highlights that effective community engagement requires institutionalized legal guarantees (Yusri 2024). Decentralization policies must align local budgetary authority with genuine public preferences (Saputri and Simbolon 2023). Without structural reform, municipal planning forums will continue to function as tools of administrative centralization (Fahmi and Hutaauruk 2022). Empowering civil society necessitates establishing legally binding participatory budgeting frameworks across all administrative levels (Zubair and Irwan 2023).

Comparative legal observations demonstrate that community development thrives when local governments prioritize inclusive civic governance (Irnawati Ahmad et al. 2026). Reforming public participation mechanisms requires transforming administrative routines into genuine deliberative platforms (De Nisa 2024). Municipal authorities must balance technical planning criteria with grassroots socio-economic priorities (Geovany et al. 2025). Strengthening democratic governance in Tanjungpinang Timur depends on bridging the gap between statutory design and local field execution (Wartono 2026). Ultimately, participatory legal mechanisms must safeguard public agency against entrenched bureaucratic domination (Syafika et al. 2026).

## CONCLUSION

The empirical investigation into the development planning forum in Tanjungpinang Timur Village reveals a profound systemic divergence between statutory participatory frameworks and practical administrative execution. The institutional operationalization of local development planning relies heavily on structural delegation through neighborhood administrative elites, thereby marginalizing direct citizen involvement and eroding deliberative democratic principles. This structural disconnect is further exacerbated by bureaucratic filtering mechanisms during municipal agency evaluations, which systematically prioritize physical infrastructure demands while discarding socio-economic and community welfare aspirations. Rather than serving as an empowering mechanism for grassroots priorities, the municipal planning framework functions primarily as a performative tool for procedural compliance under centralized state authority. Addressing these structural shortcomings necessitates comprehensive sociolegal reform, including the establishment of binding participatory budgeting thresholds, institutionalized channels for unmediated civic engagement, and transparent accountability frameworks across all tiers of regional governance.

## REFERENCES

- Abubakar, M. B., & Putra, N. H. (2025). Enhancing Governance and Community Welfare from the Perspective of Islamic Legal Politics: A Case Study of Musrenbang in Aceh. *At-Ta'fikir*, 18(2), 129-142.
- Ahmad, A., Rosadi, B., & Susniwati, S. (2024). Community Participation in the Development Planning Process of the Village Area. *Innovation Business Management and Accounting Journal*, 3(2), 144-153.
- Alrahmi, N., Asdar, M., & Erviandy, E. (2025). Designing Health from the Grassroots: Musrenbang Accountability in Health Service Planning in Bone Regency. *Jurnal Office: Jurnal Pemikiran Ilmiah dan Pendidikan Administrasi Perkantoran*, 165-176.
- Andi, A. R. N. H., Ardiansyah, F., & Nugroho, T. C. (2025). A critical assessment of public participation in Makassar's development planning. *Tamalanrea: Journal of Government and Development (JGD)*, 2(3), 180-201.
- Angellina, M., Imania, K., & Pengestu, A. (2026). Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah (Musrenbang). *Jurnal Administrasi Publik dan Pemerintahan*, 5(1), 68-74.
- Bawamenewi, K. A. (2026). Analisis Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Pendidikan, Sains, Ekonomi dan Teknik*, 1(1), 1-7.
- Darmo, M. P. (2019). *Partisipasi masyarakat dalam pembentukan peraturan daerah oleh DPRD dan Pemerintah Kabupaten Klaten Propinsi Jawa Tengah*. Deepublish.

- De Nisa, G. (2024). Community Participation in Village Development Planning: A Comparative Study in Bakambat and Cindai Alus Villages. *Journal of Transformative Governance and Social Justice*, 2(1), 25-41.
- Dhaniarta, Y. R., Sukowati, P., & Widjajani, R. (2025). Implementation of community participation policies in the road infrastructure development. *International Journal of Research in Social Science and Humanities (IJRSS)* ISSN: 2582-6220, DOI: 10.47505/IJRSS, 6(2), 19-26.
- Fahmi, A., & Hutaaruk, R. P. (2022). Public Participation in Local Governance: A Case Study of Development Planning in East Jakarta Administration. *Jurnal Sosial dan Humanis Sains (JSHS)*, 7(2), 109-113.
- Geovany, D. H., Rachmawati, I., & Sampurna, R. H. (2025). Community Participation in the Development Plan of Mande Village, Mande District, Cianjur Regency. *LAW & PASS: International Journal of Law, Public Administration and Social Studies*, 2(4), 229-237.
- Hutagalung, S. S. (2022). *Buku ajar partisipasi dan pemberdayaan di sektor publik*. Literasi Nusantara Abadi.
- Ibrohim, I., & Ismanudin, I. (2025). Performance of Regional Development Planning Policy through Development Plan Deliberation (MuSRENBANG) in the framework of optimizing regional autonomy. *Gema Wiralodra*, 16(1), 22-34.
- Iqbal, T., & Muliadi, M. (2024). Peningkatan Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Musrenbang Desa Meunasah Teungoh Melalui Grup WhatsApp. *Kawanad: Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 3(2), 127-138.
- irrawati Ahmad, S., Wantu, S. M., & Mahmud, R. (2026). Community Participation in Village Development through Musrenbang in Bubeya Village, Suwawa District, Bone-Bolango Regency. *JURNAL POLAHI*, 4(2), 191-212.
- Kusumastuti, A., & Khoiron, A. M. (2019). *Metode penelitian kualitatif (purposive sampling)*. Sukarno Pressindo.
- Mahi, A. K., & Trigunarso, S. I. (2017). *Perencanaan pembangunan daerah: Teori dan aplikasi*. Kencana.
- Menteri Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia. (2017). *Peraturan Menteri Dalam Negeri Nomor 86 Tahun 2017 tentang Tata Cara Perencanaan, Pengendalian dan Evaluasi Pembangunan Daerah, Tata Cara Evaluasi Rancangan Peraturan Daerah tentang Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Panjang Daerah dan Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah, serta Tata Cara Perubahan Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Panjang Daerah, Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah Daerah, dan Rencana Kerja Pemerintah Daerah*. Kementerian Dalam Negeri Republik Indonesia.
- Mustanir, A., Syarifuddin, H., Pratama, R., Sellang, K., Lubis, S., Rifdan, R., & Niswaty, R. (2024). Community Participation in Development Planning Deliberations in Marawi Village, Pinrang Regency, Indonesia. *Asian Political Science Review*, 8(2).
- Noer, K. U. (2022). *Partisipasi publik: Model, pendekatan, dan praksis*. E. Perwatt Press.
- Purnomo, T., Kameo, D. D., & Sasongko, G. (2025). The Effectiveness of Community Participation Mechanisms in The Planning and Implementation of Special Autonomy: a Study of The Jayapura Regency Government. *American Journal of Economic and Management Business (AJEMB)*, 4(9), 1586-1604.
- Ratnasari, L. D., & Hidayat, R. N. (2025). Innovation in Public Participation in Policy Formulation: An Analysis of the Utilization of Digital Musrenbang Platforms. *Jurnal Ilmiah Manajemen, Ekonomi dan Bisnis*, 4(1), 38-45.
- Republik Indonesia. (2004). *Undang-Undang Nomor 25 Tahun 2004 tentang Sistem Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional*. Sekretariat Negara.
- Republik Indonesia. (2014). *Undang-Undang Nomor 23 Tahun 2014 tentang Pemerintahan Daerah*. Sekretariat Negara.
- Riyadi, & Bratakusumah, D. S. (2004). *Perencanaan pembangunan daerah strategi menggali potensi dalam mewujudkan otonomi daerah*. Gramedia Pustaka Utama.
- Rizkiya, P., Zainuddin, Z., & Ikram, A. D. (2023). The impact of e-Musrenbang implementation on development planning process in Banda Aceh City, Indonesia. *Jurnal Geuthèë: Penelitian Multidisiplin*, 6(2), 140-146.

- Saputri, R. N., & Simbolon, N. (2023). Analysis of Musyawarah Rencana Pembangunan (MUSRENBANG) as The Realization of a Participatory Development Planning System in Indonesia. *Mahadi: Indonesia Journal of Law*, 2(1), 34-40.
- Saragih, J. R., Purwoko, A., & Purba, T. (2024). Developing Participatory Planning Model to Improve Regional Development Planning. *International Review for Spatial Planning and Sustainable Development*, 12(4), 279-302.
- Sari, R. D., Mahyuni, M., & Taharuddin, T. (2023). Community Participation in The Development Plan of Pelaihari Sub-District, Tanah Laut District in 2021. *Daengku: Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences Innovation*, 3(2), 175-180.
- Sugiono. (2020). *Metode penelitian kuantitatif, kualitatif, dan R&D* (Sutopo, Ed.). Alfabeta.
- Suni, B., Fahriansyah, O., & Sihalo, N. T. P. (2023). *Politik lokal dalam kinerja organisasi terhadap efektivitas pembangunan partisipatif pemerintah daerah pada musrenbang*. Scopindo Media Pustaka.
- Sutomo. (2020). *Institusi lokal partisipasi masyarakat dan pembangunan*. Literasi Nusantara.
- Syafika, N. A., Zakaria, M. A., Kamaru, R. K. J., Van Gobel, S., & Badjuka, A. H. (2026). Efektivitas Musrenbang dalam Perencanaan Pembangunan Desa: Peran Partisipasi Masyarakat. *Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi dan Kebijakan Publik*, 1(3), 117-123.
- Theresia, A. (2015). *Pembangunan berbasis masyarakat*. Alfabeta.
- Wartono, P. (2026). Citizen Participation in Local Government Policy Implementation in Sleman Regency. *Journal of Public Administration and Government Management*, 1(1), 9-15.
- Yusri, M. (2024). Rural Area Planning and Development Mechanisms. *Indonesian Journal Education*, 3(4), 122-126.
- Zubair, H., & Irwan, L. (2023). Community Participation Analysis in Preparation of Regional Development Work Plans in Pasangkayu Regency.