



EFFECTIVENESS OF EQUIPMENT AND COMMUNITY REPRESENTATION IN SUPPORTING THE VILLAGE HEAD TO ACCELERATE THE DEVELOPMENT OF SIRNA GALIH VILLAGE

Muhamad Chairul Fatulah^{1*}, M. Nassir Agustiawan², M. Hiffni³

^{1,2,3}Faculty of Law, Universitas Bina Bangsa, Indonesia

Email: chairulfathulah@gmail.com¹, mukhamadnassiragustiawan@gmail.com², mohammadhiffni83@gmail.com³

Abstract

Village development in Indonesia, as regulated in Law No. 6 of 2014 concerning Village Affairs (Village Law), emphasizes village autonomy to improve welfare through synergy among the village head, village officials, and community representation. However, the effectiveness of village officials and community representation is often an obstacle to development acceleration, especially in agrarian villages such as Sirnagalih Village, Mandalawangi District, Pandeglang Regency, Banten Province. This study aims to analyze the effectiveness of village officials in supporting the village head, the contribution of community representation through the Village Consultative Body (BPD) and deliberations, as well as non-legal and legal inhibiting factors that hinder the implementation of legal solutions. The research employs a normative-empirical approach with a descriptive-qualitative perspective, as illustrated through the case study of Sirnagalih Villa for the period from 2020 to 2023. Primary data obtained from semi-structured interviews with 25 respondents (village heads, village apparatuses, BPD, and community), participatory observation, and secondary data from legal documents such as the Village Law, Government Regulation Number 43 of 2014, and Village Fund Report (DD). Data analysis employs legal content analysis and thematic analysis, with triangulation to enhance validity. The study's results showed that the effectiveness of village officials was considered moderate (score 6.5/10), despite the implementation of the 68% DD program; however, it was hindered by a lack of competence (only 40% were trained) and weak coordination, which violated Article 62 of the Village Law. Community representation through BPD and Village Deliberation contributed 50%, with low participation (45%) and minimal supervision (30% of admitted reports), contrary to Articles 5-61 of the Village Law. The legal inhibiting factor includes unclear local regulations, while non-legal factors include a limited budget and patron-client culture. Overall, this collaboration only accelerates the construction of 20% of the RPJMDes target, with a total realization of 65%. The study concludes that the effectiveness of village officials and community representation is not optimal in supporting the acceleration of Development, despite the agrarian potential of Sirnagalih Village. Legal suggestions include a periodical revision of village apparatus training and an inclusive quota for deliberation (50% women/youth), as well as collaboration with the Ministry of Villages for national supervision. This study contributes to strengthening good governance in the Village, in line with the 2020-2024 RPJMN.

Keywords: Effectiveness of Village Officials, Community Representation, Village Autonomy, Development Acceleration, Village Law, Sirnagalih Village

INTRODUCTION

Village development is one of the main pillars in efforts to equalize national Development in Indonesia.¹ As mandated in Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages (hereinafter referred to as the Village Law), villages are given autonomy to manage local resources and the potential to realize community welfare. This village autonomy not only covers administrative aspects but also involves the active participation of the community as the main representation in the decision-making process. The village head, as the executive leader of the Village, holds a central role in accelerating Development, supported by village officials (such as the Village Secretary, Treasurer, and Technical Implementers), as well as community representation through the Village Consultative Body (BPD)

and Village Deliberation. The presence of village officials is a crucial element in ensuring the effective implementation of government functions, Development, guidance, and community empowerment.

The effectiveness of village officials is reflected in their ability to manage administration, prepare development plans, and implement policies set by the village head. Meanwhile, BPD exists as a representative institution that represents the community's aspirations while exercising control over the village government's operations. It aims to ensure that village development is conducted in a participatory, transparent, and accountable manner, so that community interests are genuinely taken into account in every development program. However, in practice, it is not uncommon to find an imbalance in the roles between the village head, village officials, and the BPD. Village heads are often more dominant in determining the direction of Development, while village officials are not yet entirely professional in carrying out their duties. Likewise, BPD is sometimes not optimal in carrying out its supervisory function or effectively channeling community aspirations. This condition can create obstacles to the acceleration of village development, and even has the potential to give rise to conflicts of interest between the village government and the community. Thus, village development does not only depend on the availability of village funds and the village head's policies, but also on the collaboration that exists between village officials and the BPD as representatives of the community. Good cooperation between these three elements will foster the creation of village governance that aligns with the principles of good governance, namely transparency, accountability, participation, effectiveness, and justice.

Sirnagalih Village, one of the villages currently undergoing Development, faces various challenges in implementing development programs. The effectiveness of village officials in carrying out their duties and functions, as well as community involvement, which represents aspirations and social participation, are key factors in supporting the acceleration of village development. Therefore, it is essential to evaluate the effectiveness of village officials and community representation in supporting village heads in promoting village development. The ineffectiveness of these two elements can give rise to legal problems, such as abuse of authority, conflicts of interest, or even violations of the principles of good governance guaranteed by Law Number 28 of 1999 concerning the Administration of a State that is Clean and Free from Corruption, Collusion and Nepotism (KKN). For example, village officials who are not transparent in managing village funds can give rise to corrupt practices or misappropriation of the budget. In contrast, the BPD, which is passive in monitoring the village head's policies, has the potential to perpetuate policies that are detrimental to the community.

Furthermore, the effectiveness of village officials and community representation is closely related to the implementation of general principles of good governance (AUPB), such as the principles of legal certainty, expediency, openness, proportionality, and justice. Suppose village officials and the BPD fail to fulfill their roles in accordance with the legal framework. In that case,

these principles will be neglected, resulting in a weakening of the village government's legitimacy in the eyes of the community. Therefore, strengthening the capacity of village officials and optimizing the role of the BPD is an essential prerequisite for effectively, participatively, and lawfully developing Sirnagalih Village.

Therefore, a legal analysis of the effectiveness of village officials and community representation is crucial to support village heads in accelerating Development, while ensuring compliance with the national legal framework. This analysis is also essential for measuring the extent to which the implementation of village government in Sirnagalih Village aligns with the principles of good governance, as well as the general principles of good governance (AUPB), and national policies that prioritize equitable Development at the village level. Thus, it is hoped that this research can contribute not only to the academic realm but also as a practical recommendation for village governments to improve development governance that is more participatory, transparent, and sustainable.

METHOD

The method used is normative empirical. The researcher chose an empirical normative approach in the study because it was in accordance with the research objectives, namely to determine the effectiveness of the village head in mobilizing community participation in village development in Sirnagalih Village, specifically regarding the phenomena of interest in the research problem.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Effectiveness of Village Apparatus in Supporting Village Heads. Based on primary data from interviews with five village officials and observations for two weeks, the effectiveness of village officials in Sinargalih Village was rated as moderate, with an average score of 6.5 out of 10 based on indicators of competence, coordination, and contribution to Development. Article 62 of the Village Law requires village officials to be professional and accountable; however, the findings reveal this inconsistency.

1. Competence and training

Only 40% of village officials hold a bachelor's degree or have received special training from the Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration. Interviews with village secretaries (RD-02) revealed that the lack of training led to administrative errors in DD management, resulting in delays in reporting to the sub-district of up to 2-3 months. It is contrary to the Village Ministerial Regulation Number 21 of 2020 concerning Village Development Guidelines, which requires regular training.

2. Coordination with the Village Head

Coordination is considered adequate in planning (80% of the program is in line with the Village's medium-term development draft). However, it is weak in implementing weekly meetings, as the village apparatus is often passive, with the village head's decision-making, which violates the principle of collaboration outlined in Article 26, paragraph 3 of the Village Law. Case Example: The 2022 suspension bridge construction program is six months behind schedule due to a lack of technical coordination.

3. Contribution to the acceleration of Development

Of the 15 DD programs in 2023, village officials have successfully implemented 70%, with a particular focus on infrastructure. However, economic empowerment was only 50% realized, due to limited equipment capabilities in monitoring business groups. Data from the village accountability report show that this effectiveness increased by 15% after the ad hoc training intervention conducted by the sub-district in 2023.

Position, Duties, Functions, Authority, Rights, and Obligations of a Village. The village head is the highest leader in the administration of village governance, holding a strategic position as the organizer of government, Development, and community affairs at the village level. The position of the village head is emphasized in Law Number 6 of 2014 concerning Villages, which designates them as an organizing element of village government, alongside village officials and the Village Consultative Body (BPD). In carrying out his role, the village head has the task of organizing the village government, implementing development projects, community development initiatives, and empowering village communities. This task is carried out in accordance with the principles of participation, transparency, accountability, and local wisdom.

The function of the village head is not only limited to administration, but also includes functions as a leader, protector, and driver of village development. This function makes the village head the central figure who determines the direction of village development policies in accordance with community needs. The village head's authority includes original authority, village-scale local authority, as well as other authorities assigned by the government, provincial government, or district/city government. It reflects the existence of autonomous space for village heads to organize and manage the interests of village communities in accordance with local potential and conditions. Apart from that, village heads have certain rights, such as receiving a fixed income, obtaining legal protection while carrying out their duties, and receiving capacity-building support from the government. However, the village head is also burdened with obligations, including implementing the principles of good governance, drafting village regulations together with the BPD, maintaining community order, managing village finances transparently, and being accountable for the implementation of duties to the community and local government.

Community Representation through BPD and Village Deliberations

Community representation in Sinargalih Village is realized through the BPD and village meetings, as regulated in Articles 55-61 of the Village Law. From interviews with 7 BPD members and 10 community representatives, participation was assessed as low to moderate, with an average village meeting attendance level of 45% (based on observation data from 5 deliberation sessions in 2023).

1. Role of BPD

Successfully drafted three village regulations in 2020-2023, including a village regulation on priority Development, which is in line with Article 56 of the Village Law. However, the monitoring function is weak; an interview with the chairman (RD-03) stated that only 30% of village head reports were audited in depth, due to a lack of access to Village Fund financial information. Observations indicate that the Village Supervisory Agency is more reactive than proactive, as evidenced by the case of alleged mark-ups in the 2022 irrigation budget, which were not followed up on.

2. Village Deliberation

This mechanism involves representatives from 12 hamlets; however, dominance by traditional leaders (70% of participants) reduces inclusiveness, particularly for women (only 20% of participants) and youth (15%). It is contrary to Article 54, paragraph 2 of the Village Law, which emphasizes various representations. Example: DD 2023 Allocation Deliberation only discusses infrastructure, ignoring the aspirations of women's empowerment, which causes 40% dissatisfaction among public respondents.

3. Contribution of aspiration

Community representation contributed 50% of the program ideas, such as the Cooperative Program, but implementation was only 60% due to a lack of follow-up from BPD. Secondary data from the Minutes of Deliberation shows a 10% increase in participation after the District socialized the Village Law in 2023 Contribution of Village Officials and Community Representation to the Acceleration of Development. Collaboration between village officials and community representation supports village heads in accelerating Development, with the realization of the DD program reaching 65% between 2020 and 2023 (village report data). Acceleration can be seen in infrastructure: The construction of 5 km of village roads has been 80% realized, supported by the coordination of BPD devices and deliberations. However, economic empowerment is slow (50% realization) due to the minimal integration of community aspirations into implementation.

Interviews with village heads (RD-01) indicated that this support accelerated the RPJMDes target by 20%, but obstacles, such as the COVID-19 pandemic (2020-2021), reduced its effectiveness. Overall, this contribution aligns with Article 78 of the Village Law regarding DD management, but requires improvement to achieve the target of 100% realization.

Legal Analysis of Effectiveness and Representation

From a normative legal perspective, the effectiveness of village officials in Sirnagalih Village is suboptimal due to non-compliance with Article 63 of the Village Law regarding competency-based appointments, which creates a gap between norms and reality (gap analysis). Cross-analysis with Government Regulation Number 43 of 2014 reveals that the absence of administrative sanctions (Article 97 of the Village Law) exacerbates the problem, as evidenced by cases of late reporting that go unpunished.

For the representation of society, empirical findings contradict the principle of participatory democracy outlined in Law Number 28 of 1999 concerning Good Governance, as low inclusiveness violates the principle of equality (Article 5). The jurisprudence of the Supreme Court N Omor 123K/TUN/2020, concerning Village Disputes, confirms that BPD must be independent; however, in Sirnagalih, dependence on the village head reduces the effectiveness of supervision.

Using Satjipto Rahardjo's theory of legal effectiveness (2006), Village Law norms are materially effective in the field, with the main inhibiting factors being legal (unclear Village Regulations regarding training) and non-legal (low community literacy). Legal solutions include revising the Sirnagalih Village Regulation to require annual training and a 50% participation quota for women and youth in deliberations.

CONCLUSION

The effectiveness of the village apparatus in supporting the village head in accelerating Sirnagalih Village Development, as per applicable legal provisions, is considered moderate, with an average score of 6.5 out of 10 based on competency, coordination, and contribution indicators. Although village officials can realize 68% of the Village Fund Program (DD), especially in basic infrastructure, ineffectiveness is evident due to the lack of professional training (only 40% of personnel are trained) and administrative delays that violate Articles 62 and 63 of the Village Law on Professionalism and Appointment Terms. Coordination with the village head is effective in planning but weak in implementation, resulting in program delays, such as the construction of a suspension bridge, which lasted up to six months. Overall, the village apparatus supports the acceleration of Development partially, but is not optimal due to the gap between legal norms and empirical implementation.

Community representation through the Village Consultative Body (BPD) and village deliberations contributes to supporting the village head in accelerating the Development of Sirnagalih Village. However, the level of contribution is low to moderate, with an average participation rate of 50%. The BPD succeeded in drafting three Village Regulations (Perdes) and accommodating aspirations, in line with Articles 55-61 of the Village Law. However, the supervisory function was weak (only 30% of reports were audited). Village deliberations were less inclusive (45% attendance, with the dominance of traditional leaders and minimal participation of women and youth). It reduces

the legitimacy of development decisions, such as DD allocations that ignore economic empowerment. It is contrary to the principles of participatory democracy (Pateman, 1970) and Article 54 of the Village Head Law, which emphasizes the legitimacy of the program (50% of the program ideas originated from the community). However, it failed to accelerate full realization due to the community's low follow-up and political literacy.

Legal and non-legal factors that hinder the effectiveness of village officials and community representation include: (a) legal factors, such as the lack of clarity in local regulations (only 5 Perdes related to Development) and the lack of administrative sanctions (Article 97 of the Village Law which is rarely implemented); and (b) non-legal factors, such as limited training budget (Rp. 50 million/year), patron-client culture, and the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic which has reduced participation. The legal solutions formulated include revising Village Regulations to require annual training of village officials and implementing a 50% inclusive quota for vulnerable groups in the Ministry of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration (Kemendes PDTT), subject to national supervision.

Overall, the effectiveness of village officials and community representation in Sirnagalih Village has not fully supported the village head in accelerating Development, despite the Village having high agricultural potential. Improvement is needed through local legal reform and institutional empowerment to achieve sustainable village autonomy, in line with the principles of Pancasila and Article 18B, paragraph 2 of the 1945 Constitution.

REFERENCES

- Pandeglang Regency Regional Development Planning Agency (Bappeda). (2022). *Village Development Evaluation Report in Mandalawangi District*. Bappeda Pandeglang Regency. (Quoted in Chapters I and IV for local development data).
- Bogor Regency Central Statistics Agency (BPS). (2023). *Profile of Sirnagalih Village, Mandalawangi District*. BPS Pandeglang Regency. Accessed from <https://banten.bps.go.id> on January 10, 2024. (quoted in Chapters I and IV for demographic and poverty data).
- Bass, B. M., & Riggio, R. E. (2006). Transformational Leadership (2nd edition). *Lawrence Erlbaum Associates*. (Quoted in Chapter IV for the theory of the Village Head's Leadership)
- Hidayat, R., & Santoso, B. (2021). "Village Autonomy and Community Participation: Analysis of the Implementation of the Village Law in Rural Banten." Documentation Network and Legal Information (JDIH) of the Ministry of Law and Human Rights. (2024). Compilation of regulations regarding village autonomy. Accessed from <https://jdih.kemenkumham.go.id> June 2024. (Quoted in Chapter III for Literature Study). Ministry of Villages, Development in 20 Disadvantaged Areas, and Transmigration (Kemendes PDTT). 2020-2023. (2023). Report on the Realization of Village Funds of the Ministry of PDTT. <https://www.kendesa.go.id> on February 15, 2024. Accessed from the Ministry of Research and Technology/National Research and Innovation Agency. (2021).
- Kemendikisaintek/Brin Research Ethics Guidelines. (Quoted in Chapter III for research ethics). Student. Marzali, P. M. (2005). *Legal Research Methods*. Rajawali Press. (Quoted in Chapters I and III for the Normative Research Approach)