Village Governance under the Village Law:
Findings from Sentinel Villages Baseline Study
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Overall purpose:

to monitor the implementation of the Village Law (UU 6/2014) from 2015 to 2018.
Methodology and Location

- **Districts**: 5
- **Villages**: 112
- **Village Heads**: 112
- **Community Activists**: 222
- **Health Sector Workers**: 224
- **Education Sector Workers**: 192
- **Hamlet Heads**: 112
- **BPD Heads**: 112
- **Households**: 2,240
  - Women: 2,125
  - Men: 1,956
- **Jambi**: Merangin, Batanghari
- **Jawa Tengah**: Banyumas, Wonogiri
- **NTT**: Ngada

- **Quantitative**
  - **Jambi**: 5 observers stay in the villages for regular monitoring
- **Qualitative**
  - **Jawa Tengah**: Banyumas, Wonogiri
  - **NTT**: Ngada
Timing of Study

- **Baseline Quant**: SEP-NOV ‘15
- **Ongoing Monitoring**: JAN-FEB ‘16
- **Endline Quant**: JUNE ‘18
- **Baseline Qual**: JAN-FEB ‘16
- **Endline Qual**: JAN-FEB ‘18
Examine whether Village Law (VL) implementation is following the stipulated principles of participation, transparency, and accountability in village governance processes.

Observe whether VL implementation is leading to more responsive village government as reflected in the decisions that correspond to community priorities.

Examine whether the existence of local institutions (such as the BPD and/or adat council) and village activists (such as former PNPM actors) influence VL implementation.
Key Findings

Participation
Villagers have little interest to participate in village discussion, namely *musyawarah desa* (*musdes*). Even when they attend, their engagement is somewhat limited. Hamlet meetings are more popular with villagers.

Information
Villagers have little interest in village government-related information, including about village funds and plans.

Representation
Village activists appear to frequent both *musdes* and *musyawarah dusun* (*musdus*) and are more engaged in discussions.

Role of Districts
Districts policies influence village governance.
PARTICIPATION
Participation rate in village and hamlet level meetings by district

- **Batanghari**
  - Village: 26.0
  - Hamlet: 16.1

- **Merangin**
  - Village: 20.8
  - Hamlet: 15.3

- **Banyumas**
  - Village: 14.2
  - Hamlet: 15.9

- **Wonogiri**
  - Village: 11.0
  - Hamlet: 44.4

- **Ngada**
  - Village: 59.7
  - Hamlet: 64.4
81.7% of villagers said they had been invited to village meetings...

But village planning meetings are **not open** to all villagers, only:

- **44%** Village Heads issue invitations to deliberate the annual workplan (RKP)
- **36%** Village Heads issue invitations to deliberate the village budget (APBDes)
Characteristics of village- and hamlet-meetings attendees and non-attendees

DID NOT ATTEND

- Female
- Household Headed by Female
- Distance to Village Head Office (km)
- No Formal Education
- Bottom-40

ATTENDED

- Completed Secondary and Beyond
- Currently Working
- Submitted Complaints or Report Problems
- Active in Local Organization
- Active in Political Party
- Village Head is Reliable in Implementation
Interest in participation: Planning

Villagers face external and internal barriers that prevent them from participating in meetings.

Cited reasons for non participation:

- Irrelevant: 17%
- Not Invited: 70%
- Busy: 17%

But not being invited is not the main reason people do not attend the meetings:

- More than half of the invitees do not come
- Villagers consider village meetings as not their business but the government’s
- Heads of RT/RW and hamlets represent villagers in these meetings
- Attending meetings inflict financial and social costs to villagers—taking them away from their work and domestic chores, particularly for women
Villagers’ Participation in Infrastructure Construction Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participation Form</th>
<th>Interest in Participation</th>
<th>Villagers' Participation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Labor</td>
<td>85.7%</td>
<td>66.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building Material</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Villagers said they participated in local infrastructure activities.
Almost all Village Heads, claimed to have socialized their village plans and fund use, but mainly to selected groups (e.g. the BPD, hamlet and RT/RW heads, and other community leaders).

The sharing of information actually disseminated to the public was much lower than claimed by Village Heads (75 % on village plans, and 68.2 % on the use of village funds) – see next slide.
Almost all Village Heads claimed to have announced Village Programs and Village Funds Use.
The preference of information dissemination methods of both villagers and Village Heads also influenced the level of villagers’ awareness.

• When villagers and Village Heads preferred the same methods, villagers’ awareness was higher, like in Ngada, Wonogiri and Banyumas.

• The preferred information dissemination methods include: meetings (*musdes* and *musdus*), verbally by village apparatus, and social/religious gatherings.
36.4% of villagers declared outright of having no interest in any village-related information.
Their interest was only in information that directly and immediately impacted them, such as in aid programs (e.g. *raskin*) and (schedule of) project implementation when they were expected to work or contribute their labor.
VILLAGE ACTIVISTS,
BPD AND FACILITATORS
Village activists have potential to represent communities

Over **75%** of village activists attended village deliberative meetings and engaged actively in discussion. Village activists have similar concerns with villagers regarding priority problems in their village.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>All obs</th>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Men</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Harvest Failure</td>
<td>0.5024*</td>
<td>0.4374*</td>
<td>0.3494*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Road Infrastructure</td>
<td>0.5592*</td>
<td>0.3504*</td>
<td>0.5235*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Access to Clean Water</td>
<td>0.1688*</td>
<td>0.1222*</td>
<td>0.1586*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note:
1) Numbers in the table are correlations on problems cited by villagers and village activists
2) *statistically significant at 5 percent
# Activists’ participation in deliberative meetings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>WOMEN</th>
<th>MEN</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Provided suggestion</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>92.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed activities</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>86.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked about program</td>
<td>55.1</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked about program targets</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>58.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asked about budget</td>
<td>43.0</td>
<td>57.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voted for decision</td>
<td>63.2</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Female village activists were almost as engaged as their male counterparts in meetings, indicating that, they potentially are able to help air the voices of their fellow female villagers.
Facilitators and BPDs are expected to play an important role to improve participation, transparency and accountability. Functioning BPDs make Village Heads work for the community’s betterment.
However, these two expected “drivers of change” are hardly visible:

Problems with recruitment and management of professional facilitators while “organic” facilitators are not nurtured either.

BPDs as “formal” representatives of the villagers were not yet functioning per the VL as operational regulations were not in place when baseline data were collected.

BPD heads’ experience in PNPM and being directly elected correspond with lower villagers’ participation (findings will be explored further).

In contrast, when Village Heads and half of his staff have PNPM experience, have participated in VL related trainings, or have been in office for more than three years, participation is higher.
ROLE OF DISTRICTS
District-level policies are key in driving VL implementation.

For example, on priorities usage of village funds and provision of technical supports.
KEY TAKEWAYS
Key takeaways

- Strengthening hamlet deliberation meetings
- Improving representation to strengthen qualities of public participation
- Raising public awareness to monitor governance through better information materials and dissemination methods
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