

Institutional Accessibility in Providing Development Data as a Primary Dimension of the Village Government's Public Accountability

Muhammad Taufiq¹, Rahmad Hidayat^{1*}

¹Department of Administrative Science, Universitas Mbojo Bima, Indonesia

*Correspondence Email: rahidsmart@gmail.com

Received: 21 June 2023; Revised: 27 February 2024; Accepted: 29 February 2024

Abstract: *This essay examines the extent to which the village government is institutionally accessible in conveying development data to its citizens. Dervin (1973) defines institutional accessibility as the ability and willingness of public institutions to provide individuals with essential information. The easily accessible nature of such governmental entities would result in greater accountability and transparency in government administration, development, and community responsibility, which are constitutional obligations of state institutions. The authors describe the Rabakodo Village administration's level of public accountability in managing development operations, as evidenced by institutional accessibility to creating general information disclosure. This is a descriptive-qualitative study that uses focus group discussions and in-depth interviews as the primary methods of data collection. Public accountability may not have been fully implemented up to this point due to the lack of serious consideration given to the attempts to develop responsible village governance in Rabakodo Village. The lack of sincerity can be seen in the absence of adequate communication media to publicize the village development program while meeting the community's needs for information on specific development operations. The village government's failure to optimize the availability of different communication platforms and provide full access to village development information posed a barrier to increasing participatory democracy, inclusiveness, and public accountability. Such a low level of institutional accessibility steadily diminishes the possibility of confronting detrimental practices, non-populist policies, and the corrupt orientation of village-level state actors.*

Keywords: *accessibility; accountability; disclosure; information; secrecy.*

How to Cite:

Taufiq, M., & Hidayat, R. (2024). Institutional Accessibility in Providing Development Data as a Primary Dimension of the Village Government's Public Accountability. *Journal of Governance*, 9(1), 127–142.

<https://doi.org/http://dx.doi.org/10.31506/jog.v9i1.20634>



This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-ShareAlike 4.0 International License.

Introduction

This article describes the village government's level of institutional accessibility in producing and communicating development data to its citizens. The concept of institutional accessibility reflects the ability and willingness of public organizations to deliver the necessary information to individuals (Dervin, 1973: 15). The village government, as the holder of village administration, should promote public information openness and provide access to development data on a regular, periodic, and continuous basis. The village government controls the budget, implements numerous development initiatives, and reports the results of these programs as public information.

Because of the Central Administration's considerable commitment to village funds, the 2014 Village Law in Indonesia provides new hope for the gradual continuation of village administration (Antlöv et al., 2016). Failure to manage the budget honestly may cause the authority over the allocation of village funds to backfire on the village administration. The village law compels the village authority to provide communities with open access to information (Taufiq et al., 2024). Information sharing demonstrates the village government's (and especially the village heads') public accountability. According to Article 27 of the Village Law, the village head is obliged to (1) present a report to the Regent or Mayor at the end of the fiscal year; (2) after the end of the period of office, submit a report to the Regent or Mayor; (3) at the end of each fiscal year, provide written statements of government administration to the Village Consultative Body; and (4) share information about government

administration with the community at the end of the fiscal year.

Because of the village law, the village government must practice public information disclosure. This legislation establishes the village as a self-governing community based on the democratic principle, with inhabitants having the right to assume control of the village administration (Jacqueline et al., 2017). The village government discloses information to provide villagers with details on the policies and practices governing their management. Applying this approach will embed accountability into village governance.

Openness to public information is crucial for a democratic country to preserve people's sovereignty and ensure effective state management. It has become a way of optimizing public oversight of state administrations, other public agencies, and everything that impacts the public interest (Consideration b & c Law No. 14/2008 on Public Information Disclosure). On the part of government institutions, public information openness aims to achieve good state management that is transparent, effective, efficient, and responsible. Improving information management and service delivery within a public organization has resulted in high-quality information services (Gorla et al., 2010).

Furthermore, to combat corruption in the village and increase the village government's responsibility, it takes control of the community within the framework of available public information, which is inherent in the village government's constitutional duties. The Village Law, as stipulated in Article 68 paragraph (1), also provides the community with broad access to information about village governance: (a)

requesting and obtaining information from the village government and overseeing village administration activities, implementing village development, fostering community socialization, and empowering villagers; (b) obtaining the same and fair service; and (c) conveying aspirations, suggestions, and oral or written opinions.

Experts believe that the village government's dissemination of information about development activities to citizens is crucial for achieving transparency and accountability. Because access to official documents, which is required for self-determination and responsibility, is more legitimate and trustworthy in the public eye (Blanke & Perlingeiro, 2018: 3). Disclosing government information will enhance accountability and decision-making. Greater openness in decision-making entails responsibility for the choice and requires the participation of a broader variety of stakeholders. Access requirements promote efficiency in information-gathering and record-keeping operations, increasing consultation response and allowing for the correction of faulty or missing information (Stewart, 2015).

Transparency can also promote greater institutional legitimacy or trust, reduce corruption and rent-seeking, reduce costs associated with establishing agreements or encouraging compliance, and allow for more effective implementation of public policies in general (Ackerman & Sanoval-Ballesteros, 2006: 92); justifications for openness in government (Stewart, 2015: 81); better decision-making and transparency (Bertot et al., 2010; Dawes, 2010a, 2010b). It aligns with high-level goals to improve government through data provision.

The right to information is critical because the country's administration is becoming more accountable by opening state administration to public scrutiny. Everyone has the right to acquire knowledge, which is also crucial to improving community participation in shared decision-making. Participation or involvement in the community is only meaningful with the assurance of public information disclosure (Zhao, 2010). Providing citizens with information motivates public institutions to be accountable and devoted to providing the best public service possible. As a result, it can accelerate the implementation of open government, which is a strategic effort to combat corruption, collusion, and nepotism, as well as the development of good governance (General Explanation of Law No. 14/2008 on Public Information Disclosure).

The critical motivations for revealing government information are: (1) Transparency: For a democratic society to function correctly, citizens and other stakeholders must examine the legitimacy of government acts. Transparency also implies that users should be able to utilize, reuse, and disseminate data. Transparency significantly increases citizen social control; (2) Social and commercial values are released in various domains. All data, whether school addresses, geospatial data, environmental data, transportation, data planning, or data budgeting, has social and commercial values that are not what they intended. The government encourages stakeholders to innovate and provide new services by publishing such data; and (3) Participatory governance—rather than voting in elections every number of years, citizens are encouraged to participate actively in governance processes such as decision-making and policymaking. Additionally, open government data

initiatives, such as portals, can help stakeholders make more informed decisions (Alexopoulos et al., 2014; Rojas et al., 2014; cited by Attard et al., 2015: 399–400).

Based on the preceding reasons, this article proposes to investigate the level of public accountability of village governments in development management, at least in terms of institutional accessibility in providing villagers with access to general information. In other words, the authors want to confirm the village government's ability and willingness to apply the notion of making public information available.

Method

Our study delved deeper into the analysis of concrete barriers that hinder public information access and community participation in village decision-making forums. This research investigated the village government's disclosure of public information, its accessibility and usage by residents, and how budget management and village planning practices reflect community involvement in decision-making processes. Using a qualitative descriptive approach, we gathered data from in-depth interviews and focus group discussions to reveal the intricate dynamics of accountability within the context of Rabakodo village. Thus, this study provided an overview of the extent to which village governance practices apply accountability principles and identified particular barriers that impede the realization of better accountability at the local level.

We have diligently implemented the descriptive approach, which systematically explains phenomena and offers detailed insights into the issues under study (Kumar, 2018). Through focus group discussions (FGD) and in-depth

interviews, this research has pursued a comprehensive understanding of the accountability challenges within Rabakodo village's governance structure. By strategically sampling, we gained valuable insights into the condition of public accountability and inclusion in village affairs, particularly regarding budgeting and planning, through the purposeful selection of key informants among village government officials and residents.

Over a meticulous five-month fieldwork investigation, we have gathered data from 20 participants across these informant categories. During the in-depth interviews, we explored critical aspects such as citizen engagement in civic forums and the accessibility of public information provided by the village authority. The interview results will help us improve data mining through a comprehensive FGD involving all informants. Our study uses a strict method that includes observations, study papers, and direct interactions to give us rich information about the social, physical, and structural barriers people face in the village when they try to get information and participate in making decisions.

Result and Discussion

The Village's General Public Accountability Issue

Rabakodo Village is 18.3 kilometers from the Bima District Government Centre. It becomes one of fifteen villages in the Woha Sub-District, with an area of 1.36 km² and a population density of 2,460 per km². This village has a population of 3,346 people, with 1,670 men and 1,676 women. Rabakodo Village comprises four hamlets: Talabiu Village on the North Side, Tente Village on the South Side, Samili Village on the West Side, and Runggu Village on the East Side.

To ensure public accountability, developing responsible village governance in Rabakodo Village still requires full implementation. Rabakodo Village Government's responsibilities in managing village development are in "bad shape" since the planning, budgeting, and implementation stages of village development are under the jurisdiction of the present Village Head (2020–2026 period). The dysfunction of officials' roles and village institutions, as well as the frequent use of extortion by village authorities, strongly influence the practice of administering a village government. The village administration's response is primarily based on the "political will" of the village head, who positions himself as the subject of dominative authority. In contrast, other village officials rely entirely on his commands.

As the Head of Economic Development Affairs, I have never been involved in village planning forums, and even in the realm of the development project, I was not involved at all because I only carried out the tasks ordered by the village head and the rest I never did. The village head's direction and instructions influence my actions. My main job is to collect taxes and fees from residents. That's all there is to it! Previously, when neighbours approached me to inquire about prosperous rice, I said, ;I do not know! "The people also made fun of me for not knowing anything about the situation" (March 17, 2023, interview with Mr. Rusli Yusuf, Head of Economic Development Affairs at Rabakodo Village Government).

The unfortunate reality regarding public participation in village planning-budgeting forums is that, on average, the impoverished and other vulnerable groups do not participate in village

planning-budgeting forums hosted by the village government. They have never been in a village planning forum, such as the Hamlet Deliberation "*Musyawah Dusun*," Village Consultation "*Musyawah Desa*," or Village Development Planning Consultation "*Musyawah Perencanaan Pembangunan Desa*," to formulate or discuss the *RPJMDesa*, *RKPDesa*, or *APBDesa*. As a result, marginalized groups do not have access to or the opportunity to convey their demands to the village government.

"Regular citizenship forums such as the Musyawah Dusun have not been part of my experience, and if asked about them, I would be unsure of what to say. Farmers like me are rarely invited to such gatherings and are typically only considered for participation in cooperative activities" (interview with Mr. Usman, Agricultural Labour, on March 20, 2023).

Regular civic forums sponsored by the village government have never acknowledged villagers from marginalized groups as participants. Non-elite villagers, like them, are unaware of "informal invitation mechanisms" that can enable their participation in the village planning-budgeting forum, as outlined in Village Minister Regulation "*Peraturan Menteri Desa*" No. 2/2015 on Village Conference Standing Orders and Decision-Making Mechanisms. The Village Government's refusal to disclose the schedule for organizing frequent citizenship forums through mandatory "informal channels" adds to the lack of knowledge.

Passive citizens with zero experience in participating in the Village Planning-Budgeting Forum cannot have their title removed because they cannot utilize the "Official and Unofficial Pathways" outlined in regulations, particularly the *Peraturan*

Menteri Desa No. 2/2015, to engage in the annual planning-budgeting forum. Even though marginalized groups, such as the impoverished and disabled, participate in specific citizenship forums, their participation is contingent on meeting formal criteria. They, particularly representatives of disabled groups, were used as 'joke materials' in the debate forum because they were deemed incapable of arguing.

"Disabled people have never been invited to participate in a village forum; how can we include them when they are paralyzed and unable to move? On average, they can only lie in their beds" (interview with Mr. Sudirman, Head of the Lavendo Hamlet, Rabakodo Village, on March 18, 2023).

Even worse, village officials frequently subject vulnerable people to illegal charges in exchange for the social assistance they would receive. During an interview on March 25, 2023, Mr. Bandu, a brick craftsman from Rabakodo Village, revealed that he had registered as a prospective recipient of home surgery assistance, paid the requested administrative fee to village government staff, but has yet to receive the assistance.

The setting of Rabakodo Village gradually supports the thesis that the portrayal of citizens in the decision-making forum at the village level has been inaccurate or merely superficial. Despite being present in the village's multi-stakeholder space, they have, on average, been unable to advocate for and fight for their interests in the village government. There will be many problems, like protests or bad reactions, when the public is not involved in making decisions about local government plans (Abas et al., 2023). Government institutions' failure to uphold democratic traits such as openness and

respect for debate in policymaking will expose them to the "vulnerability virus" of delegitimization by people in the social movement (Hidayat, 2019).

Some citizen groups may be absent or purposefully excluded from the planning and budgeting process, often because they are considered inconsequential or adequately represented by the elite. Village officials and elites maintain control over village planning and budgeting. Regular citizen forums in the village planning and budgeting framework often receive the label "the arena of village elites" due to their tendency to generate conflicts of interest and favor specific groups.

Recent Condition of Communication Media Availability and Public Access to Information

In this paper, a communication medium is defined as a forum or space (a social institution) that brings together village government and communities both formally (via regular citizenship forums such as village meetings) and informally (via religious activities, meeting residents at the hamlet level, or through applications (digital technology-based media) that allow citizens to communicate with the village government). The village government does not actively use adequate communication media to publish village development programs or accommodate residents' needs for information on certain development activities or programs. That demonstrates the village government's unwillingness to be transparent in transmitting village budgeting information.

The village government limits public information access and openness to exhibiting "the *APBDesa* Infographics" in one area that remains inaccessible to all inhabitants (often only displayed in front

of the village office). The village government has not prioritized making other strategic documents available to the public, such as the Village Development Implementation Report or the *APBDesa* Realization Report.

During the Focus Group Discussion at the Village Office Hall on April 21, 2023, Mr. A. Harissufwaddin, Head of Rabakodo Village 2020-2026 Period, reported that they had allocated a portion of the 2017 Village Budget to develop a village information system using infographic boards and online platforms. This system aims to publicly share information on village development management, activities, and budget allocations according to the *RKPDesa* and *APBDesa* 2017. In 2018, there was a desire to allocate a larger budget for the same activity.

Access to and openness to village information is wider than the construction of village information systems. This should be considered the most basic form of development management by the Rabakodo Village government.

"Residents should appreciate the transparency seeds of village development management that we plant through the development of Sistem Informasi Desa, even though its contents are still limited to general information on village government activities and development programs and activities being carried out. The government of Rabakodo Village also attempted to apply the principles of public information disclosure by distributing data in informal forums such as Mbolo-Weki via information boards such as billboards in strategic and central locations such as mosques, schools, and certain shopping areas. We have given each Hamlet Head sound-system

equipment to socialize rapidly with what is relevant to the residents. It is our goal to publicize and publicize the RKPDesa and APBDesa so that people are aware of the financial situation and its allocation in village development" (Responses of Mr. Syamsuddin, Secretary of Rabakodo Village, in the Focus Group Discussion, held at the Village Office Hall on April 21, 2023).

People believe that the village government's assessment severely constrains and heavily depends on its desire to provide information to all existing residents. Certain information is only available to people with a close relationship with specific village leaders and is not open to the public. Existing formal forums, such as the *Musyawah Perencanaan Pembangunan Desa*, still restrict communication media, as they only involve specific community sectors and cannot represent the interests of all social groups.

"I have never come across that there is another communication medium utilized by the Rabakodo Village Government to disseminate information on village development to residents, as stated earlier by the Village Secretary. It is the communication medium only in exclusive informal forums where everyone cannot access it. The media of informal interaction between residents and the village government is nothing more than Mbolo-Weki meetings about organizing personal activities such as wedding ceremonies and so on. The village government is only engaged in these activities to convey information on village government activities whose level and scope are general. The manifestation of transparency and accountability of

the village government in managing rural development by providing access to village information disclosure to citizens should not stop at the point of developing Sistem Informasi Desa only but needs to be supported by the willingness to provide information as widely as possible to anyone who needs or has an interest in confirming the truth of certain issues relating to the village" (Responses of Mr. Febi Ramdani, a college student, in the Focus Group Discussion, held at the Village Office Hall on April 21, 2023).

Transparency in village development management should ideally target the village government's openness to accepting and delivering thorough information about anything the locals want. Residents must also access the APBDesa realization reports or development implementation reports online via the Sistem Informasi Desa, as well as through information boards in strategic areas accessible to all villagers.

"The communication media for the delivery or publication of the APBDesa are essential to creating transparent and accountable impressions of village government in the eyes of citizens. I agreed that the Mbolo-Weki meeting had functioned as a medium for delivering or publicizing the APBDesa because many people attended such informal meetings. I have frequently heard people ask the village government to explain the details and stages of the APBDesa usage so that they do not hesitate and wonder about the topic again because they have already received clarification" (Responses of Mr. Mulyadin, Deputy Chairperson of Rabakodo Village Consultative Board, in the Focus Group Discussion, held at

the Village Office Hall on April 21, 2023).

The community, in addition to the village government, plays a vital role in village development management, and the village administration must disseminate any public information, both in writing and vocally, through various means that are compatible with curiosity or the needs of the community to uncover crucial details regarding village growth. The 2014 Village Law requires the Village Government to consistently disclose public information, such as the Village Revenue and Expenditure Budget (APBDesa), via the Village Information System (Sistem Informasi Desa/SID), the Village Infographics Board, and other media. Various parties must publish information to prevent mistrust, accusations, or mutual blame regarding the ideal design of village development management for promoting public welfare in the village.

The facts presented above further confirm that Rabakodo Village's communication media and public access to information are currently insufficient. The village government does not actively utilize suitable communication channels to disseminate information about village development programs or cater to residents' information needs regarding specific activities or programs. This lack of transparency indicates the village government's reluctance to disclose village budgeting information.

The village government currently limits public access to information by only displaying "the APBDesa Infographics" in one area, typically in front of the village office, which many residents find inaccessible. Authorities do not make strategic documents like the Village Development Implementation Report or

the APBDesa Realization Report available to the public.

Despite allocating funds for developing a village information system, including village infographic boards and online sites, critics find the village government's transparency efforts minimal. These channels provide information on general village government activities and ongoing development programs. The government also attempts to disclose information through informal forums such as Mbolo-Weki meetings and information boards in strategic locations like mosques, schools, and shopping areas. However, certain information remains restricted, and formal communication continues to exclude many residents from participating in decision-making processes.

Residents emphasize the need for wider access to village information beyond the limited channels provided by the village government. They advocate for unrestricted access to information, making it readily available to anyone interested in understanding village affairs. To ensure transparency in village development management, the village government must be open and forthcoming with information, including detailed reports on budget allocation and development progress (Handayani et al., 2023).

While the village government plays a crucial role in disseminating information, the community is also responsible for engaging with and seeking information about village development. Through various media channels, the Village Law mandates consistent disclosure of public information, including the Village Revenue and Expenditure Budget (*APBDesa*). This transparency is critical to fostering trust and collaboration among all stakeholders (Schnackenberg & Tomlinson, 2016) in

village development management, ultimately working towards the common goal of promoting village public welfare.

The relationship between communication media availability, public access to information, and the village government's transparency efforts is intricate and pivotal in fostering accountable governance within Rabakodo Village. Effective communication media serve as conduits for disseminating vital information about village development programs and budgeting. However, the limited availability of diverse communication channels impedes residents' access to crucial information. This scarcity underscores the need for the village government to diversify communication platforms to cater to the various information needs of its residents.

The village government's transparency efforts are dependent on public information accessibility. Inadequate transparency measures hinder residents' ability to scrutinize the allocation of village resources and participate meaningfully in decision-making processes. As a result, enhancing transparency through comprehensive disclosure of village budgeting and development progress is critical to instilling trust and accountability among residents.

Moreover, the relationship between communication media availability, public access to information, and transparency efforts is symbiotic. A transparent and accessible communication framework fosters informed citizens and promotes active participation in village affairs (Rodríguez-Navas et al., 2021). Conversely, restricted access to information undermines trust in the government and exacerbates accountability challenges.

We need a comprehensive approach to tackle these interconnected issues effectively. This approach should focus on expanding communication channels, promoting transparency, and empowering residents by providing them with better access to information. By fostering an environment of openness and accountability, Rabakodo Village can forge stronger bonds between the government and its constituents, driving sustainable development and community empowerment.

The Village Government's Institutional Accessibility to Creating Public Information Disclosure

No one would dare question the reality that providing broad access to public information is the cornerstone of accountability. Government institutions must be willing and able to disseminate information to all those interested. Institutional accessibility of public organizations also determines the quality of democracy in a country because it is vital to strengthen the formal legitimacy of government institutions, which coincides with citizens' activeness in collaboratively implementing development and government tasks.

The degree to which public organizations are institutionally accessible to public information disclosure is undeniable and will have a positive impact on government institutions and citizens. Access to administrative files is one aspect of government transparency (Anderson, 1973: 419). The public must strengthen government openness by exercising their right to be heard and influence government policy (Brooke, 2005: 9). In terms of the workings of institutions in a democratic society, the right to information is intended to make it practical for the management of public

affairs and the decision-making processes of public administrations (Sindic, 2012: 5).

Although institutional accessibility is a fundamental obligation that state institutions must meet, the practice is still a long way off due to specific barriers that limit movement and the willingness and capability of government organizations to implement the mandate fully. In other words, not all public organizations can make institutional accessibility the primary feature of their constitutional tasks' operationalization. This setback is based on a number of fundamental difficulties that limit state actors' willingness and capacity to relate the principle of public information disclosure to the mechanism of administering government obligations and public services under the constitutional mandate. These obstacles can take the form of (1) government institutions as information sources consciously preventing individuals from obtaining the information that is required; (2) government agencies as information sources may not be competent or organized enough to handle specific information needs; and (3) government institutions as information sources may present inaccurate or untrustworthy information (Dervin, 1973: 16–17).

Refusing to provide public access often fosters the belief that not all information requires sharing with the public, as some details are sensitive and should remain confidential. One of the reasons government personnel loathe openness is that it exposes their flaws, which is humiliating. On the other hand, avoiding humiliation should not be the driving principle of any government; rather, having an effective and well-run organization should be. Making mistakes is how we learn, and the government is no exception. A government agency that

avoids accountability fails to address its flaws, thus impeding its capacity for genuine learning and growth. Bad practices will persist until they reach a level of incompetence or corruption that renders any effort to remedy the catastrophe futile. The problem is a lack of trust among the public, and faith in government is crucial for a functioning democracy (Brooke, 2005: 5).

According to this argument, the harsh reality is that governments have an interest in keeping secret information that indicates their policies are wrong. Many organizations that provide evidence for policy decisions are self-interested individuals who may produce biased or skewed data. Keeping this information secret allows it to remain uncontested with little chance of early error discovery. Widely contested policies are more likely to receive public support and trust (Brooke, 2005: 9).

As discovered in Rabakodo Village, the village government (particularly the village head) is only partially willing to conduct constitutional duties in disseminating written information on government administration at the end of the fiscal year. Some of the interviewed villagers acknowledged that the village government had purposely restricted the public's access to all information about village development management, including specifics about the implementation of the development program and the execution of the village budget.

Even though village government informants insisted on using the public information disclosure principle in village governance administration, field data indicate that the Village Information System, the Village Infographic Banner, the Village Information Board, and informal communication channels used

for public information dissemination do not meet the eligibility requirements.

The Government of Rabakodo Village did not have any online SID site serving as a communication channel for conveying village information to the public, despite all village government officials who were informants previously describing it as "available." The information board in front of the Rabakodo Village Office Hall appears neglected and lacks critical data that locals can freely access. The report is generic in terms of village participation in specific district, provincial, and national contests. There was never any information relating to the budget of development programs or the allocation report as a reflection of transparency and accountability in managing village development. The village government apparatus utilizes a variant of special communication media to display information on the annual work plan through an infographic banner on one wall of the village office hall. However, a report does not accompany the budget realization. As a result, locals need more access to information on village development management, as the Rabakodo Village Government needs to share it more genuinely.

The lack of public information dissemination communication media in Rabakodo Village demonstrates one of Dervin's (1973) institutional accessibility barriers, in which government institutions acting as a source of information may intentionally prevent individuals from obtaining the required information. Authorities created this condition to conceal all information considered a local government secret, making it "taboo" to spread. Sometimes, public institutions treat precise budget information for implementing a development project as confidential and unsharable. This situation harmed the Rabakodo Village

government's institutional accessibility to administering village development in a transparent and responsible manner. This lack of institutional willingness and skill also impacts the villagers' inability to supervise the village government's performance, resulting in an absence of participatory democracy in village life. The perception of a non-inclusive regular civic forum contributes to the deterioration of public accountability for the government in Rabakodo Village.

The above explanations highlight several key points regarding the actors' approach to institutional accessibility and public information disclosure in Rabakodo Village. There is a fundamental understanding that broad access to public information is vital for ensuring accountability in governance. However, the village government's approach demonstrates a partial willingness to fulfill its constitutional duties in disseminating written information about government administration.

Despite claims to adhere to principles of public information disclosure, field data indicate significant shortcomings in communication channels and information dissemination practices. The government neglects the village information board and fails to establish a centralized communication channel. Furthermore, the lack of effective communication channels reflects institutional barriers to information accessibility. Government institutions intentionally prevent individuals from accessing necessary information, hindering transparency and accountability in village development management.

Our analysis underscores the need for the village government to adopt a more proactive approach to public information disclosure. That includes addressing institutional barriers, improving

communication channels, and fostering a culture of transparency and accountability within the community.

The village government's ability to provide public information disclosure is crucial for fostering accountability and strengthening democracy within Rabakodo Village. However, despite the fundamental obligation of state institutions to ensure broad access to public information, several barriers hinder the full implementation of this mandate. These obstacles include deliberate access restrictions, a lack of competence or organization within government agencies to handle specific information needs, and the presentation of inaccurate or untrustworthy information.

The reluctance to provide public access to information often stems from a fear of exposing flaws within the government. However, transparency is essential for identifying and rectifying mistakes, fostering public trust, and promoting a functioning democracy. Without accountability, bad practices persist, undermining the effectiveness of governance and eroding public trust in government institutions (Hikmawan & Hidayat, 2016). High levels of good governance come from holding public officials and administrative bodies more accountable. A good government must utilize legal and moral principles to enhance accountability among people and institutions (Keping, 2018).

In Rabakodo Village, the village government's willingness to fulfill its constitutional duties regarding public information disclosure is only partial. Despite claims to adhere to public information disclosure principles, field data reveal significant shortcomings in communication channels and information dissemination practices. The village government's lack of a centralized

communication channel and neglect of the village information board show its insufficient commitment to transparency and accountability in managing village development.

This lack of institutional accessibility not only hampers residents' ability to monitor the performance of the village government but also undermines participatory democracy within the community (Glass & Newig, 2019). The perception of a non-inclusive civic forum further exacerbates the erosion of public accountability for the government in Rabakodo Village. Addressing these barriers and enhancing institutional accessibility is essential for promoting transparency, accountability, and participatory governance in the village.

Conclusion

Our analysis delves into the broader implications for governance theory and the conceptualization of participatory democracy within the context of village-level administration. At its core, this research sheds light on the intricate relationship between institutional accessibility, public accountability, and participatory democracy. It underscores the pivotal role of institutional accessibility in fostering transparency and citizen engagement, which are foundational elements of a robust democracy. By examining the challenges faced by Rabakodo Village in terms of institutional accessibility and public information disclosure, we contribute to the theoretical understanding of governance dynamics at the local level.

Furthermore, this study's findings have implications for theories of democratic governance and citizen participation. They highlight the importance of proactive measures by governments to ensure broad access to

information and facilitate meaningful citizen involvement in decision-making processes. The failure of the Rabakodo village government to uphold its constitutional commitments and adhere to principles of public information disclosure serves as a cautionary tale, emphasizing the risks of institutional opacity and exclusivity in democratic governance frameworks.

Moreover, this research underscores the significance of the 2014 Village Law and similar legislative mandates in promoting participatory and inclusive governance practices. By analyzing the discrepancies between legal requirements and actual implementation in Rabakodo Village, it offers insights into the challenges and opportunities associated with legal frameworks aimed at strengthening local democracy.

When citizens criticize the village government for being exclusive, unresponsive, or even non-democratic in its development management, it reflects the low level of institutional accessibility of the village-scale state institutions that cannot hold their constitutional commitments responsible. The institutional accessibility of the village government will primarily influence its public accountability by providing broad access and openness to public information, allowing villagers to oversee the administration of government practices.

In Rabakodo Village, the level of institutional accessibility of the village government is pretty low because different communication media that could help them interact with citizens and keep them up to date on village development management approaches and strategies, as well as the progress and problems the village government is facing in that area, are not fully functionalized.

The lack of disseminated data regarding village planning and budgeting has trapped residents in informative isolation confinement, resulting in "passivity" in applying for their supervisory role over the village government's policies and patterns of public affairs management. The unfortunate reality stems from the village government's unwillingness to open the faucets of comprehensive development data to the public. Public institutions use the secrecy factor to justify limiting citizens' freedom to access data.

The village government's intention to violate citizens' rights to information is a barrier to strengthening the degree of participatory democracy, inclusion, and public accountability in Rabakodo Village. As institutional accessibility gets worse, it becomes harder to change harmful practices, policies that don't support the people, and the corrupt nature of village-level state actors. However, active citizens can still use these actors if they know how to properly handle development data from the village administration.

People did not believe the village government's exaggerated claims when they attempted to release information to the public in Rabakodo Village. This showed that the village government hadn't followed through with its 2014 Village Law duty to use this important principle as a guide to improve rights and justice in village government and make sure that everyone could participate and benefit from public services.

Acknowledgement

The Authors would like to express their gratitude and honours to be assisted by everyone, especially people from Department of Administrative Science, Universitas Mbojo Bima.

References

- Abas, A., Arifin, K., Ali, M. A. M., & Khairil, M. (2023). A Systematic Literature Review on Public Participation in Decision-Making for Local Authority Planning: A Decade of Progress and Challenges. *Environmental Development*, 46, 100853. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envdev.2023.100853>
- Ackerman, J., & Sanoval-Ballesteros. I. (2006). The Global Explosion of Freedom of Information Laws. *Administrative Law Review*, 58(1), 85-130.
- Anderson, S. V. (1973). Public Access to Government Files in Sweden. *The American Journal of Comparative Law*, 21(3), 419-473. <https://doi.org/10.2307/839295>
- Antlöv, H., Wetterberg, A., & Dharmawan, L. (2016). Village Governance, Community Life, and the 2014 Village Law in Indonesia. *Bulletin of Indonesian Economic Studies*, 52(2), 161-183. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00074918.2015.1129047>
- Attard, J., Orlandi, F., Scerri, S., & Auer, S. (2015). A Systematic Review of Open Government Data Initiatives. *Government Information Quarterly*, 32(4), 399-418. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2015.07.006>
- Bertot, J. C., Jaeger, P. T., & Grimes, J. M. (2010). Using ICTs to Create a Culture of Transparency: e-Government and Social Media as Openness and Anti-Corruption Tools for Societies. *Government Information Quarterly*, 27(3), 264-271. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2010.03.001>

- Blanke, H. J., & Perlingeiro, R. (2018). Essentials of the Right of Access to Public Information: An Introduction. In Blanke, H. J. & Perlingeiro, R. (eds.), *The Right of Access to Public Information: An International Comparative Legal Survey* (pp. 1–70). Berlin, Germany: Springer.
- Brooke, H. (2005). *Your Right to Know: How to Use the Freedom of Information Act and Other Access Laws*. London: Pluto Press.
- Dawes, S. S. (2010a). Stewardship and Usefulness: Policy Principles for Information-Based Transparency. *Government Information Quarterly*, 27(4), 377–383. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.giq.2010.07.001>
- Dawes, S. S. (2010b). Information Policy Meta-Principles: Stewardship and usefulness. Proceedings of the 2010 43rd Hawaii International Conference on System Sciences, January 05–08, 29, IEEE Computer Society Washington, DC, USA, pp. 1–10. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1109/HICSS.2010.233>
- Dervin, B. (1973). Information Needs of Urban Residents: A Conceptual Context. In Warner, E. S., Murray, A. D., & Palmour, V. E. (eds.), *Information Needs of Urban Residents* (pp. 8–42). Final Report. Washington, DC: Bureau of Libraries and Learning Resources.
- Glass, L. M., & Newig, J. (2019). Governance for Achieving the Sustainable Development Goals: How Important Are Participation, Policy Coherence, Reflexivity, Adaptation and Democratic Institutions? *Earth System Governance*, 2, 100031. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.esg.2019.100031>
- Gorla, N., Somers, T. M., & Wong, B. (2010). Organizational Impact of System Quality, Information Quality, and Service Quality. *The Journal of Strategic Information Systems*, 19(3), 207–228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jsis.2010.05.001>
- Handayani, E., Garad, A., Suyadi, A., & Tubastuvi, N. (2023). Increasing the Performance of Village Services with Good Governance and Participation. *World Development Sustainability*, 3, 100089. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wds.2023.100089>
- Hidayat, R. (2019). Public Distrust and Environmental Citizenship: Primary Impetuses of Radical Protest in Bima District, 2011-2012. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik*, 22(3), 187–200. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jsp.35981>
- Hikmawan, M. D., & Hidayat, R. (2016). Depoliticisation of Public Issue: Low Degree of Government's Democratic Legitimacy (The Case of the Reclamation Policy of Benoa Bay, Bali, Indonesia). *Journal of Governance*, 1(1), 27–41. <http://dx.doi.org/10.31506/jog.v1i1.1311>
- Jacqueline, V. E. L., Zakaria, Y., & Bedner, A. (2017). Law-Making as a Strategy for Change: Indonesia's New Village Law. *Asian Journal of Law and Society*, 4(2), 447–471. <https://doi.org/10.1017/als.2017.21>
- Keping, Y. (2018). Governance and Good Governance: A New Framework for Political Analysis. *Fudan Journal of the Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11, 1–8.

- <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40647-017-0197-4>
- Kumar, R. (2018). *Research Methodology: A Step-by-Step Guide for Beginners*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- Peraturan Menteri Desa No. 2 Tahun 2015 tentang Tata Tertib dan Mekanisme Pengambilan Keputusan dalam Musyawarah Desa.
- Rodríguez-Navas, P. M., Morales, N. M., & Lalinde, J. M. (2021). Transparency for Participation Through the Communication Approach. *International Journal of Geo-Information*, 10(9), 586. <https://doi.org/10.3390/ijgi10090586>
- Schnackenberg, A. K., & Tomlinson, E. C. (2016). Organizational Transparency: A New Perspective on Managing Trust in Organization-Stakeholder Relationships. *Journal of Management*, 42(7), 1784–1810. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206314525202>
- Síndic, S. (2012). *The Right of Access to Public Information*. Monographic Report. Spain: Sindic de Greuges de Catalunya.
- Stewart, D. (2015). Assessing Access to Information in Australia: The Impact of Freedom of Information Laws on the Scrutiny and Operation of the Commonwealth Government. In Wanna, J., Lindquist, EA, & Marshall, P. (eds.), *New Accountabilities, New Challenges* (pp. 79–158). Australia: ANU Press.
- Taufiq, M., Nursansiwati, D. A., & Hidayat, R. (2024). Belajar Reflektif Keterbukaan Informasi Publik di Desa Berbasis Prinsip Kepemerintahan Melalui Transparansi. *Panrita Abdi-Jurnal Pengabdian Pada Masyarakat*, 8(1), 194–205.
- <https://doi.org/10.20956/pa.v8i1.26137>
- Undang-Undang No. 6 Tahun 2014 tentang Desa.
- Undang-Undang No. 14 Tahun 2008 tentang Keterbukaan Informasi Publik.
- Zhao, Y. (2010). Public Participation in China's EIA Regime: Rhetoric or Reality? *Journal of Environmental Law*, 22(1), 89–123. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jel/eqp034>