



Village Governance through Spirit of Dynamic Governance in Village Government, Indonesia

Andi Antono; Ngalimun; Guntur Gunarto; Hikmah Nuraini; Endang Dwi Sulistyoningsih;
Slamet Rosyadi

Universitas Jenderal Soedirman, Indonesia

E-mail: mokwerj@unisa.ac.za, makolmg@unisa.ac.za

<http://dx.doi.org/10.47814/ijssrr.v6i3.910>

Abstract

Dynamic governance results from capacity building to carry out development activities and adaptive policies to produce effective policies. The application of dynamic governance in village government involves three instruments of dynamic thinking: thinking ahead, thinking again, and thinking across, with the aim that villages can be adaptive and be able to institutionalize cultural values to spread a spirit of innovation to support prosperous development activities. This research was conducted by interactive qualitative analysis, starting with data collection, data condensation, data display, and drawing conclusions. The informants in this research are village government heads, stakeholders, and community leaders. Snowball sampling was used to collect informants while allowing them to express themselves freely. The results of the study show that by thinking ahead, the stakeholders build a mutually agreed-upon vision and mission and act progressively to build a modern village. In the pattern of "rethinking," stakeholders take advantage of village institutional meetings to review it repeatedly to improve work plans toward productive activities from their natural resources. Meanwhile, as a sustainable social welfare pendulum, stakeholders build social networks with outsiders to seek other resources such as financial assistance and expertise. This study adds to extended knowledge of governance practices at a local level in relation to rural development programs implementation in Indonesia.

Keywords: *Dynamic Governance; Rural Development; Village Government*

Introduction

Development that has been initiated for a long time in Indonesia has focused on urban areas, which have brought changes to the face of a neat city with the facilities that are needed by city people, such as adequate infrastructure, housing, economic facilities such as markets and bus terminals, and so on. The development strategy that is more oriented toward urban areas has resulted in inequality.

Development inequality is the difference in the level of development that occurs between developed areas, namely urban areas, and underdeveloped areas, which often describe the rural situation, even though there are poor people in developed areas and vice versa. The impact of uneven development in Indonesia is the occurrence of inequality in various sectors, such as employment, public facilities, and education (Todaro, 2000). This led to many actions in Indonesia.

Since Law No. 6 of 2014 on Villages, the direction has changed, previously from urban to rural areas. Current development focuses on rural areas; people call it "building a community from the periphery" because villages can manage village funds autonomously. According to the Village Law, Village Funds are defined as funds originating from the APBN that are intended for villages that are transferred through the Regency/City APBD and are used to finance government administration, development implementation, community development, and community empowerment.

The problems faced by village administrations in rural areas are basically not much different from those of sub-district administrations generally located in urban areas. Social problems such as high poverty rates, low health status, low consumption levels, limited facilities and infrastructure, and low levels of education often occur in villages. However, not all villages are considered underdeveloped if the village has better category records. Currently, in Indonesia, there are 5,559 (7.55%) independent villages, 54,879 (74.49%) developing villages, and 13,232 (17.96%) underdeveloped villages (BPS, 2020). These existing problems can be overcome with development in the village. With village funds and other financial assistance, the village is increasingly improving itself to become an advanced and modern village. In addition, the development model that is carried out moves from the bottom up, meaning that villages are given the freedom to determine the priorities of development activities in accordance with the needs of the community to achieve the desired level of welfare and prosperity for the community.

Performance-based, forward-thinking leadership is required to reveal the difficulty of the village's problems; criticism is viewed as a square-off for improvement; and the ability to build a broad network is also required. Performance leadership is not just planning, implementing, and evaluating but also requires strong leadership character (Tery, 1972). Leaders must be able to determine dynamic and sustainable policy directions in the village government system, bearing in mind that changes in life go so fast and are full of the dynamics of social change.

Effective collaboration is realized through various processes such as communication, cooperation, and flexibility (Ansell & Gash, 2008). Inter-agency collaboration in achieving goals in the public interest Inter-organizational collaboration can be created through public values and innovation in decision-making processes, power relations, and building trust (Vangen et al., 2014). In village governance, management must directly involve stakeholders in a policy-making process that is formal, consensus-oriented, and deliberative in making public policies to form dynamic policies.

The definition of dynamic policies in the village governance system is based on dynamic governance theory. Dynamic governance is the result of the strong will and ambition of leaders to ensure the survival of society. The required leadership quality is dynamic leadership with the ability to manage various elements in an integrated manner amidst continuous change through clear strategies, smart management, continuous learning, seeking adaptive and relevant paths, and effective policy execution. Systematically, building the capabilities of everyone involved in the process to ensure that innovative new ideas are accommodated in realistic policies, projects, and programs, and consistently coordinating all organizational activities to lead to the achievement of goals (Morse & Buss, 2014),

The complexity of the problems faced by every government in various countries today indicates that good government and good policies alone are not enough. More than that, the most important challenges of the millennial era are "dynamic, cut across many decisions, involve the need for continuous learning, and rest on effective and rapid implementation" (Neo & Chen, 2007). Therefore, what is needed

is a government that is able to answer this challenge. In this context, the concept of "dynamic governance" is becoming a current trend as an accurate answer to the challenges faced by governments in various countries. Neo and Chen (2007), in their seminal book, believe that dynamic governance is the key to the success of the current government of Singapore.

Governance at the central level of government is accompanied by governance at the village level. Every year the village government is obliged to determine development activities through the "Musrenbangdes," which involves the Village Representative Agency (BPD) and other elements of society, just as the central government formulates the state revenue and expenditure plan (RAPBN) together with the House of Representatives (DPR). However, for Neo and Chen, this process is not enough if it is not supported by a strong leadership character to move forward and have a vision for a productive future. In this study, researchers tried to find leadership characteristics in village-level leaders who met the criteria suggested by Neo and Chen. Why is the concept of "dynamic governance" important to elaborate on? Because in this millennial era, leaders must have the skills to read future situations and be able to use information technology adequately so that they can organize village government effectively and efficiently. From the description of the background, this research can formulate the problem as follows: How is village governance carried out through the spirit of dynamic governance in the village of Banjarnayar, Sokaraja District, Banyumas Regency?

Method

This research is located in Banjarnayar, Sokaraja District, Banyumas Regency. The informants of this research include village officials, the BPD chairman, the Village Community Resilience Agency (LKMD) head, community neighborhood (RW) heads, and village community leaders. The selection was made *purposefully* with the consideration that they knew very well the focus of the research on village governance. Data collection techniques included in-depth interviews, observation, and document analysis. Data analysis techniques were carried out interactively, starting from data collection, data condensation, appearance data, and research conclusions (Miles, Huberman, and Saldana, 2014).

Results and Discussion

Characteristics of Village Communities as the Basis of Community Culture

The characteristics of the people of Banjarnayar Village can be seen in the aspect of education, which is still relatively low. Of the 5,433 local residents as shown in Table 4, the majority, or 30.23 percent, had just finished elementary school or the equivalent, 17.87 percent had completed STLP, and 17.27 percent had completed high school. Those with diploma I or II education made up 0.03%, those with academy or baccalaureate education made up 1.19 percent, and those with strata I education made up 2.28 percent. From these facts, it can be said that the population of Banjarnayar Village is still relatively low. Furthermore, the profile of the Banjarnayar Village population as viewed from the point of view of the type of work.

Meanwhile, as viewed by the type of work, 11.77 percent worked as casual daily laborers, 9.95 percent were private employees, and 5.03 percent were self-employed. The largest number are residents who are not working or unemployed at 25.47 percent, followed by residents who take care of the household at 19.38 percent. These figures suggest that the population of Banjarnayar Village, which is classified as unemployed and does not have a permanent job, is significantly larger than the population that works in the government sector or has a permanent job. The two characteristics, namely education and work, are a reflection of the condition of the village community. In addition, these characteristics can

later be used to help examine the culture of the village community in relation to the implementation of development through the spirit of dynamic governance carried out by the local village head.

Table 1. List of Development Activities in Banjaranyar Village

No t	Activity Description	The amount of costs	Source of fund	Percentage
1	Construction of the Susukan River Gap	Rp. 65,000,000	Village Fund	8.6
2	Asphalt road environment RW 05	Rp. 125,000,000	Provincial financial assistance	16.6
3	Road slope in RW 01	Rp. 200,000,000	Provincial financial assistance	25.5
4	Asphalt road RW 07	Rp. 75,000,000	District financial assistance	10.9
5	Construction of RW 01 road talud	Rp. 125,000,000	District financial assistance	16.6
6	Farming Business Road (JUT) of Pandak block	Rp. 100,000,000	Department of Agriculture	13.2
7	Farming Business Street (JUT) of Dewi Sri block	Rp. 65,000,000	Village Fund	8.6
	Amount	Rp. 755,000,000		100

Source: Banjaranyar Village Government 2022

In 2022, Banjaranyar Village carried out development activities funded from various sources, namely financial assistance from the province, district financial assistance, assistance from the agricultural service, and costs originating from village funds. The data shows that development activities in Banjaranyar Village tend to receive assistance from the Banyumas Regency and the Provincial Government of Central Java. The village head appears to have a fairly broad network, making it easy to obtain assistance for the development of his village and allowing him to avoid relying on financial assistance from the residents.

Dynamic Governance in the Development Program Implementation

The concept of "dynamic governance," as it is known today, is a government's ability to continuously adjust public policies and programs, as well as change the pattern of how public policies are formulated and implemented so that they have an impact on the long-term interests achieved. This concept is motivated by an environment that is experiencing rapid movement and change, resulting in a widening gap between the educated and less educated populations, between the rich and the poor, and so on. Unknowingly, this dynamic pattern of government has been implemented with great leadership at the provincial, district/city, and village government levels because it is capable of producing change. These areas continue to be addressed by building social and economic infrastructure for people's welfare.

Research conducted by Martoyo and Sihaloho (2021) on *dynamic governance strategies* in administering government in West Java Province concluded that the implementation of dynamic governance functions as a driving force in the framework of world-class West Java government defense. The policies are formulated in accordance with the needs of today's society and, at the same time, are directed to face various global and rapidly changing challenges. Similar research was also carried out in Makassar City, which concluded that dynamic governance has been able to change the face of the

government for the better through the vision and mission of Makassar City as a world city that is comfortable for all (Akbar, 2018). Another study entitled "Implementation of Dynamic Governance in the COVID-19 Pandemic Handling Program in Sanur Kaja Village, Province of Bali" means that through *adaptive policies*, the local government can handle and cure COVID-19 sufferers among foreign tourists (Ikhlas, 2022).

The research discussion mentioned above provides good knowledge and inspires researchers to search for information related to dynamic governance in Banjaranyar Village, Banyumas Regency. Based on the conceptual analysis, the researcher verifies the development activities resulting from the thinking of the village head and *other stakeholders*, which are based on forward-thinking, policy review thinking, and cross-network thinking. The arrangement of the three thoughts is presented in the narratives conveyed by the informants as follows:

1. Thinking Ahead (Thinking Forward)

Forward-thinking structures try to reach ideas that are speculative in nature but are believed to be realized through hard work with a vision and mission as an entry point towards social change. It is perceived as difficult to advance the village community because they are accustomed to life as it is or the mindset that exists in other village communities.

For this reason, in determining development planning, it must be conducted carefully, still relying on the traditional pattern, that is, depending on who wants it. Gradually, we are working with the head of the BPD (village representative agency), who is just starting to determine the data analysis according to the designation. In this case, the village head tends to focus on developing infrastructure with economic value, such as markets, irrigation canals, and sports fields, by providing places to sell. The focus of development like this is accepted by the community.

2. Rethink (Thinking Again)

Reviews of decisions and policies will be carried out on things that have already happened, including the use of data, new information, predetermined standards, legacy problems from a policy or program, and feedback received. The results of the researcher's interview with Karseno (the village head) gave an overview of the direction of the policy being made, and village government officials realized that the policy needed to be aligned with the changes that had occurred. The BPD acts as a catalyst between the expectations of the village head and those of the community. In the deliberation forum, a village head can show quality as a leader, willing to accept various calls and create a spirit of togetherness to reciprocate one another. In development planning, the village head includes a budget for youth activities that focus on sports activities and the establishment of a reading garden. The community was given space around the village square for the village library. The process of planning development activities from the past until now is not much different; it all depends on the wishes of the leader. It could happen since the village head is able to build good informal relations so that it seems as if it has been resolved. For example, the construction of Embung Sitong is actually good, but it costs a lot of money. What is being done is not only repairing the pond but also preparing access roads that are still narrow. The only way is to widen the road, but it seems that this is difficult to realize.

3. Thinking Across (Cross-Thinking)

The government is trying to get fresh ideas and thoughts for innovating policies, strategies, and programs to improve people's welfare. Policy decisions made as a result of a process of thinking ahead, thinking again, and thinking across are then implemented in the spirit of dynamic governance. In describing information relating to cross-thinking, an example can be found in the case of building a village faster that is not dependent on village funds. In addition, the village head has to approach other

parties, both from the government and the private sector. This year the village received financial assistance from the Agriculture Office, the Banyumas Regional Government, and the Provincial Government for the physical development of the village. Other non-natural assistance from the political party network includes building a volleyball court and repairing a football field. Because of this political year, we took advantage of the situation to build a network.

Village Community Culture as a Dynamic Governance Implementation Challenge

The culture of the village community is closely related to the values of togetherness and kinship, which are characteristics of social life. The cultural values that exist in rural communities are inherited from previous generations and passed down to the next generation. Apart from cultural wealth, village people also have potential and natural resources. Those who consider fields and rice fields as their livelihood are called farmers, while those who consider the sea and everything in it as land for fishing are called fishermen.

According to Koentjaraningrat (1985) in his book entitled *Human and Culture*, the order of society basically has 7 elements of culture, including knowledge system, food system, kinship system, religious system, technology system, language, and art. In relation to governance and the *spirit of dynamic governance*, village leaders prioritize adaptability to changing times, digitalization, and technological developments while still upholding human values that grow in the village, such as knowledge systems, livelihood systems, and kinship systems. His leadership is able to innovate and be creative by relying on community participation. The community's involvement in policy making in the village is because the village community has the ability to find solutions to overcome problems with shared basic values and norms as well as an attitude of mutual trust toward one another. The principle of mutual benefit is the bond of social solidarity for the village community. Harmonious and equal social interaction between village organizers and the community will create balance and unity in village life.

In this research, we tried to identify data regarding the culture of the community in terms of knowledge systems, livelihood systems, and kinship systems. The knowledge system is that of the surrounding nature; the livelihood system is that of farmers; and the kinship system in the research village is one of the social relations based on blood ties. It can be explained here that the *Gemeinschaft* is a social association in which individuals tend to social communities rather than their own individual desires and needs. In contrast to *Gesellschaft*, which is a civil society in which individual needs take precedence over social associations (Putri, 2022).

Conclusion and Suggestion

In research on *dynamic governance* based in Banjarnayar Village focusing on indicators of *thinking ahead, thinking again, and thinking across*, it can be concluded as follows:

1. In the future, village apparatus will be equipped with computer programming skills for population and government data processing activities. Internet facilities have become an instrument for capturing the rapid changes in the world and an answer to people's demands for efficient service.
2. In thinking about it again, this activity was carried out in the context of evaluating the policies that had been implemented both regarding development activities and administrative service activities to the community.
3. The progress of village development will be slow if it is not done in aggressive collaboration with other parties in order to obtain financial resources. Cross-sectoral thinking has opened the way for transforming information and other facilities as a pendulum for village development.

The suggestions that need to be conveyed in dynamic governance are as follows:

1. In the aspect of the future, it is necessary for people who think forward to participate, even though they have different views, to anticipate trends and rapid future changes.
2. In the aspect of "thinking again," it is necessary to increase the ability of stakeholders to redesign policies and programs so that citizens get better services.
3. In order to think broadly, it is necessary to collaborate more closely with other parties, both government agencies and potential individuals. In this regard, the village should apply good practices from more advanced village governments.

References

- Akbar, M. (2018). Penerapan Dynamic Governance di Kecamatan Mariso Kota Makassar. Diunduh dari https://digitaladmin.unismuh.ac.id/upload/738-Full_Text.pdf.
- Ansell, C., & Gash, A. (2008). Collaborative governance in theory and practice. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 18(4), 543–571. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jopart/mum032>.
- Benu, F., Muskanan, M. W., King, P. G., Asa, H. M., & Wulakada, H. H. (2020). Community Participation and Sustainable Tourism Development Model in Komodo National Park. *Journal of Environmental Management and Tourism*, 11(2), 250. [https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt.v11.2\(42\).03](https://doi.org/10.14505/jemt.v11.2(42).03).
- BPS. (2020). *Jumlah Kelurahan/Desa Menurut Provinsi 2020*. https://www.bps.go.id/indikator/indikator/view_data_pub/0000/api_pub/43/da_02/1.
- Faedlulloh, D. (2018). BUMDes dan Kepemilikan Warga: Membangun Skema Organisasi Partisipatoris. *Journal of Governance*, 3(1), 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.31506/jog.v3i1.3035>.
- Ikhlas, Z., Erawan, I.K.P., Mertha, A.A.M.M.J. (2022). Implementasi Dynamic Governance pada Program Penanganan Pandemi Covid-19 di Desa Sanur Kaja. **Jurnal Nawala Politika**, [S.l.], v. 1, n. 1, p. 16-24.
- Koentjaraningrat. (1985). *Manusia dan Kebudayaan*. Penerbit Djambatan.
- Martoyo, M., & Sihaloho, N.T.P. (2021). Elemen Sukses Penerapan Dynamic Governance di Provinsi Jawa Barat. *Jurnal Public Policy*, 7 (1), 42-46.
- Miles, M., Huberman, A. M., & Saldana, J. (2014). *Qualitative Data Analysis: A Methods Sourcebook*. Sage, London.
- Morse, R. S., & Buss, T. F. (2014). Innovations in Public Leadership Development. In *Innovations in Public Leadership Development*. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315703435>.
- Neo, B. S., & Chen, G. (2007). *No Title Dynamic governance: embedding culture, capabilities and change in Singapore*. World Scientific Publishing Co. Pte. Ltd.
- Ompusunggu, C., Edison, E., & Setiawan, R. (2022). Dynamic Governance dalam Upaya Desa Toapaya Selatan Mewujudkan Desa Mandiri di Tahun 2023. *Jiana*, 20(1), 14–24.
- Putri, A.S. (2022). Pengertian dan Perbedaan Gemeinschaft dan Gesellschaft. Diunduh dari <https://www.kompas.com/skola/read/2019/12/23/200000469/pengertian-dan-perbedaan-gemeinschaft-dan-gesellschaft?page=all>.



- Tery, G. R. (1972). *Principles of Management* (6th ed.). Homewood, Ill. : R. D. Irwin.
- Todaro, M. P. (2000). *Pembangunan Ekonomi di Dunia Ketiga* (Y. Sumiharti & H. Munandar (eds.); 7 Terjemah). Erlangga.
- Vangen, S., Hayes, J. P., & Cornforth, C. (2014). Governing Cross-Sector, Inter-Organizational Collaborations. *Public Management Review*, 17(9), 1237–1260. <https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14719037.2014.903658>.
- Xiang, C., & Tan, M. (2019). Innovation mode and effective ways of realizing rural public management under accurate poverty alleviation. *Revista de Cercetare Si Interventie Sociala*, 65, 306–324. <https://doi.org/10.33788/rcis.65.19>.

Copyrights

Copyright for this article is retained by the author(s), with first publication rights granted to the journal.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).