

THE PHENOMENON OF *MUSRENBANG* IN TERMS OF LOCAL WISDOM: AN EFFORT TO PREVENT CORRUPTION IN THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT

By

Ahmad Taufiq Masbuhin

M. Nizarul Alim

Tarjo

Master of Accounting, Faculty of Economics and Business,
University of Trunojoyo Madura

Email: masbuhinahmadtaufiq@gmail.com; nizarul.alim@gmail.com; tarjo@trunojoyo.co.id

ARTICLE INFORMATION

Article History:

Received Sept 16, 2017

Revised Oct 31, 2017

Accepted Oct 2, 2017

JEL Classifications

D73; G28; H72

Key Words:

*Musrenbang,
willing to sacrifice,
mutual cooperation,
unity in motion*

DOI:

10.21532/apfj.001.18.03.02.18

ABSTRACT

This study views the Deliberation of Development Planning of Local Government Work Plan (Musrenbang-RKPD) process in local government in terms of local wisdom. This research explores the values contained in the motto "Hurub Hambangun Praja" finds out the extent to which the local wisdom value of "Hurub Hambangun Praja" is implemented in the Musrenbang RKPD process. The method used is qualitative with ethnography approach. In the motto "Hurub Hambangun Praja" contains the values of willing to sacrifice, mutual cooperation, and unity in motion. Sources of data or research information are obtained from interviews, secondary data and observations with research sites in Blitar Regency. The results of this study show that the application of the values of willing to sacrifice, mutual cooperation, and unity in motion in the implementation of Musrenbang is still low.

I. Introduction

Based on Law No. 25 of 2004 concerning the National Development Planning System (Indonesian: *Sistim Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional / SPPN*), one of the approaches in the planning process is a participatory process, that is, the planning that involves stakeholders, among others, through the implementation of the Deliberation of Development Planning (Indonesian: *Musyawah Rencana Pembangunan / Musrenbang*). The *musrenbang* process starts from the level of Village, Sub-District, to the level of Regency. The stages of the

musrenbang process, according to the authors' observations, have the potential to cause various kinds of problems such as not complying with the stages process, conflicts of interest between actors, and others. In addition, the budget managed by the village is getting increased in accordance with Law No. 06 of 2014 concerning the village, article 72 paragraph (4) that Village fund allocation is at least 10% (ten percent) of the balance funds received by the Regency / City in Regional Budget after being deducted by Special Allocation Funds (DAK).

Some studies question the capacity and knowledge of the *musrenbang* participants on the development holistically / comprehensively because there are still strong political interests resulting in the ineffectiveness of the follow up of the results of the *musrenbang*. Proposals for *Musrenbang* programs and activities are less effective because of the lack of access to information on development programs that are prioritized by the local government, Sopanah, 2010; Suwaryono, 2014; Wijayanti et al., 2014. The initial process of regional government budgeting that involves the community is started from *Musrenbang*. Research on the process of drafting public policy involving community participation has been carried out several times, such as by Layzer, 2002; Navaro, 2002; Adams; 2004. The results of the studies indicate low public participation. This is shown by the low attendance of the public forum. Research on the management of public resources has been carried out several times, such as Edralin, 1997; Osborne and Gaebler, 1992; Barzelay, 1992; Cohen and Brand, 1993. For the community, the expected change is an increase in democratization that can be seen from the increased community participation in the implementation of public interests including regional planning and budgeting (Callahan, 2002; Ebdon, 2002).

In the context of the *musrenbang*, we need to know the underlying actors in implementing the *Musrenbang RKPD*. In

Blitar Regency, we often see the motto "Hurub Hambangun Praja". Then the researchers are interested in conducting research by raising the theme of the *Musrenbang* process in term of the Regional Government motto "*Hurub Hambangun Praja*". "*Hurub Hambangun Praja*" means flame or enthusiasm to build the state, (Mardiono, 2014). The researchers then found the idea to examine the Deliberation of Development Planning of Local Government Work Plan (Indonesian: *musrenbang RKPD*) process in the perspective of "*Hurub Hambangun Praja*".

II. Previous Studies

Research conducted by Purba (2011) shows that *musrenbang* is a multi-stakeholder public consultation forum that discusses the development issues. Democracy and decentralization are necessary as the main foundation for supporting genuine public participation. Genuine public participation is a relatively new approach in Indonesia. The implementation of participatory governance is rather unclear. Even when the democratic method is adopted, in practice, it is difficult for some groups, especially those who are marginalized in the community, to participate and to have their voices heard. However, it should be noted that participatory development planning itself is a long and complex activity. Law and regulation approaches in the context of a new, democratic and decentralized government in Indonesia need continuous supervision to encourage quality improvement.

Hanida et al. (2015) shows that, in West Solok, there is a lack of compatibility in planning and budgeting between one document and another. This can be seen from the programs and activities on documents ranging from Local Government Work Plan (RKPD), Budget General Policy of Temporary Budget Ceiling Priority (KUA PPAS), to Regional Budget (APBD). The results also show that there are some programs and activities that suddenly

appear in the budget documents, even though they did not exist in the previous planning documents, and vice versa. This incompatibility is caused by the low organizational structure, working mechanism and coordination between institutions.

Research conducted by Wijayanti et al. (2014) using a qualitative approach with descriptive research types shows that, in Pasuruan Regency, the proposed programs and activities through the *musrenbang* process have the potential to create development activity program plans that are in accordance with community needs, however, the proposed programs and development activities from the community could not be accommodated as a whole because the community had less information about the development programs that became the priority of the regional government in the year. Performance-based budgeting in Pasuruan Regency still shows two things: (a) lack of commitment of the local government as indicated by the lack of cost analysis and delay in the preparation of Price Unit Standards, (b) lack of understanding of the planning officials related to performance indicators as indicated by different indicators outcomes for activities in one program and differences in performance targets between the Regional Work Unit (SKPD) strategic planning targets and Regional Medium Term Development Plan (RPJMD).

The results of the research conducted by Sopanah (2010), using interpretive paradigm with a phenomenological approach, show that the implementation of *musrenbang* in Probolinggo Regency is in accordance with the mechanism regulated in Law No. 25 of 2004 and Regional Regulation No. 13 of 2008 concerning Transparency and Participation in Development Planning in Probolinggo Regency. If it is associated with the meaning and nature of participation, the actual participation mechanism is still limited to formality only and

the community participation is still considered false.

The results of the research conducted by Tuasikal (2012), using qualitative methods with a phenomenological approach, show that, in Central Maluku Regency, the community involvement in regional development planning, for example in regional *Musrenbang* starting from the level of village to the level of regency, is still low. This is due to the lack of knowledge of the planning apparatus regarding the development planning, in terms of both format and technical arrangement, and the limited information and knowledge of the community related to the regional development planning process. In addition the research also shows that the regional budgeting planning is still weak, causing the government not to be able to carry out budgeting performance in accordance with the prevailing laws and regulations relating to local government systems, procedures and accounting policies.

The results of the research conducted by Satries (2010), using a descriptive approach, show that the understanding of the people of Bekasi City on the implementation of *musrenbang* is not yet comprehensive and is still limited to the formal level merely as an annual routine activity. This less comprehensive understanding of *musrenbang* has an impact on the level of community participation in the implementation of *musrenbang* forum. Based on the results of the research and discussion conducted by Sherry R. Arnstein using the theory of the degree of participation, it can be concluded that the community participation in Bekasi City is still at the degree of non-participation which consists of manipulation and therapy ladder (improvement). Therefore, so far the community participation through the implementation of *musrenbang* every year is still considered pseudo participation and does not comply with the mandate of the constitution.

The results of the research conducted by Supadmi et al. (2013), using a descriptive

approach, show that theoretically *musrenbang*, as a form of Bottom-Up development planning, has been carried out well, but not fully in accordance with what the community wants and needs. This is because, at a higher level, *ormusrenbang* at regency level, the priority of activity proposal submitted by each village must be synchronized with the SKPD development program which incidentally is Top-down. In the *musrenbang* at SKPD level, there are proposals from the sub-district *musrenbang* which eventually are not included in the development program listed in the Sanggau Regency budget, because the community proposals must compete with SKPD programs that are more mature and well-measured. This condition resulted in many activities proposed by the village community in Kapuas Sub-district not being fully implemented according to planning.

The results of the research conducted by Johnson (2004) show how participatory governance reforms, such as participatory budgeting, have an impact on the quality of democracy through public participation in policy decision making. The analysis details include how the introduction of participatory budgeting can change information patterns, preference formation, and regulatory agendas with implications for future political actions, facilitating broader political mobilization and stakeholder collaboration. With the operation of the institutional mechanism, certain conditions must be fulfilled related to the process and its most basic implementation, that is, the distribution and representation of participants. The selection of people into the participatory budgeting process must be truly inclusive, not just replicating existing patterns of involvement and participation.

The results of the research conducted by Suwaryono (2014) show that the implementation of *musrenbang* in Boyolali Regency could be said to be in accordance with the mechanism stipulated in Law No.

25 of 2004 and Regional Regulation No. 03 of 2012 concerning Regional Participatory Development Planning in Boyolali District. It is only budget meeting because the level of socialization to the community is very low. So, it is only certain communities that can find out information and propose programs. And when the regency *musrenbang* mechanism is completed, the next step in preparing the Regional Budget is dominated by political interest. If it is associated with the meaning and nature of participation, the existing participation mechanism is still limited to the formality only.

Based on the description above, the formulation of the problem in this study is: How is the implementation of the *musrenbang* RKPD in the Regional Government viewed from the perspective “*Hurub Hambangun Praja*”?

III. Research Method

This study aims to investigate the implementation of budgeting in term of the motto “*Hurub Hambangun Praja*” (enthusiasm to build the country) and the dynamics/problems in the implementation of budgeting plan starting from the *Musrenbang* RKPD. This study uses a qualitative method with ethnographic approach because it discusses *musrenbang* from the point of view of the regional motto that contains cultural and historical values. Motto “*Hurub Hambangun Praja*” (enthusiasm to build the country) contains values, such as *willingness to sacrifice, mutual cooperation, and unity in motion* in building the community / country, with low, medium and high categories according to indicators.

The value of willing to sacrifice contains 3 (three) levels of indicators:

1. Carrying out activities
2. There is an element of protection
3. Giving / Sacrificing what is owned

The value of “mutual cooperation” contains 3 (three) levels of indicators:

1. Helping each other according to the task
2. A sense of belonging in terms of maintainig and supervising.
3. Shared success.

The value of unity of movement contains 3 (three) levels of indicators:

1. Agreement
2. Commitment
3. Achieving goals according to agreement

IV. Discussion

In this section the researchers present the results of the *musrenbang* process in the perspective of the motto “**Hurub Hambangun Praja**” (enthusiasm to build the country)held in Blitar Regency. The discussion presented here is about the implementation of *musrenbang* in the field. During the implementation of *musrenbang*, improvements were made year after year to improve the process and results of the *musrenbang*. However, there were still many things that had to be evaluated comprehensively related to the implementation of Musrenbang, whether it had been implemented according to rules or not. One of them was the presence of legislative members in the Sub-district Musrenbang. This is consistent with the results of an interview with an Activity Technical Implementing Officer (PPTK) Musrenbang in Development Planning Agency at Sub-National Level (Bappeda):

“In recent years the legislative members’ attendance schedule (not overlap)”.

One thing that needs to be considered is the implementation of *musrenbang* at Sub-district level. The presence of legislative members in the *musrenbang* at Sub-district level is indeed expected to be a form of joint commitment. Bappeda makes a schedule with the distribution of 5 (five) Electoral Regions

so that the legislative members can attend *musrenbang* without clashing with *musrenbang* elsewhere:

“We make a schedule based on the Electoral Regions so as to increase the chances of the presence of the legislative members ... as a solution so that the level of attendance is high”

The following are findings in the field related to planning that is merely a formality. For example, *musrenbang* is conducted as a routine every year and even some villages do not hold *musrenbang* but only send proposals:

“There are several villages which do not carry out musrenbang process as stipulated in the legislation. The reason is, in addition to the absence of budget from the village government, the musrenbang process is a formality only. In reality, the realization for the program proposal to be financed is very low. “

Supposedly for villages that do not implement *musrenbang*, they cannot participate in the *musrenbang* at Sub-district level. The villages that do not implement *musrenbang* are in fact still able to attend the *musrenbang* at Sub-district level. The *musrenbang* at Sub-district level only sees recapitulation of proposals from villages without seeing whether the villages implement *musrenbang* or not. This happens in the field according to the interview.

It is possible ... proposals can be made without musrenbang ... so the proposalis made by the village apparatus ... just add the attendance list and minutes ... it’s okay.

Indeed, the Sub-district itself is not firm enough to impose sanctions on villages that do not carry out *musrenbang*. The Sub-district only accommodates proposals for programs and activities from the village without seeing the village proposal through the *musrenbang* process. Whereas, in the implementation of the Sub-District *musrenbang* itself, the proposal between those implementing *musrenbang* and not is given the same weight / value.

“The village is also tired because the activities are relatively the same every year ... finally some villages consider that the most important thing is there is a proposal to be submitted to the Sub-District musrenbang”

Musrenbang is composed by one or two people so that it does not accommodate the overall needs.

“In the musrenbang, the proposal presented must have the benefit not only for the village ... because activities at the village scale are funded by the village itself through the village consultation on Village Government Work Plan (RKPDes) ... This is what might make some villages not holding musrenbang.”

From the perspective of “unity of motion”, the commitment in *musrenbang* can said to be relatively low. This can be seen from the lack of commitment in collective agreement to follow up until APBD level. The *musrenbang* was “subordinated” because village government gives more priority on village consultation on Village Government Work Plan (RKPDes) which could directly be managed by the village government itself. This

is in line with the issuance of laws on village. The average budget that goes into the village is above IDR 1,000,000,000 (one billion rupiah) per village, apart from the Village Original Revenue. Meanwhile, the number of proposals from one sub-district approved through *musrenbang* is only under 25 activities, so that not all villages will receive an activity budget. The following is an interview with one of the sub-district staff who handles *musrenbang*:

“The village is now increasingly busy with a bigger budget that goes directly into the village ... so the proposals put forward in musrenbang are just a formality.”

From the perspective of “*Hurub Hambangun Praja*” (enthusiasm to build the country), the value “willingness to sacrifice” in the implementation of the *musrenbang* is very low, that is, still at the stage of willingness to provide / carry out activities without any willingness to protect the interests of society at large because the participants are only motivated to realize the proposed program / activity. If the opportunity is poorly accommodated, they do not carry out *musrenbang*. The most important thing is that they have submitted the proposed activities. *Musrenbang* should be attended and known by the community so that they will know the direction of the local government policy in carrying out its vision and mission. In addition, it is also expected that the programs / activities proposed in *musrenbang* can be effective. This is also intended to avoid any proposed program of activities that are not accommodated by the relevant SKPD due to a proposal discrepancy. Many of the proposed program activities discussed in the *musrenbang* were finally crossed out due to the lack of knowledge of the participants and the lack of socialization from the relevant agencies regarding the vision and mission of the local government and its activities.

I don't know ... If I'm asked to join, I will join ... like in previous years ... I was often invited by village government.

The value of "mutual cooperation" in the implementation of musrenbang is relatively low. Based on the observations, the value of mutual cooperation in the community related to the construction of house is still relatively good, but in musrenbang, the sense of mutual cooperation has been eroded because the participants have no sense of belonging.

I just follow it ... after that it is finished ... about the result? ... I have never been bothered ... it is not my business, but government's.

This explains that the value of mutual cooperation that is owned by the community in building a house is very big, but the value of mutual cooperation in musrenbang is very small. The participants in musrenbang feel that it is not their business but the government's. Whereas, musrenbang is a media for the community to submit development proposals, in which the results will return to the community. If the value of "Hurub Hambangun Praja" is actually carried out by the participants of musrenbang, it is expected that fraud in budgeting can be prevented.

V. Conclusion

From the perspective of "Hurub Hambangun Praja", the implementation of musrenbang is: 1) in terms of the value of willingness to sacrifice, the implementation of musrenbang is still at the level of carrying out activities only and even some villages do not implement musrenbang. The implementation has not yet reached the stage of protecting the interests of the community; 2) in terms of the value of mutual cooperation, the implementation of musrenbang is still at the level of assisting according to the task.

The implementation has not yet achieved the level of a sense of belonging; 3) in terms of the value of unity of motion, the implementation of musrenbang is still on the stage of agreement. The implementation has not yet achieved the level of commitment. This is indicated by the low proposals accommodated into the RKPD. If the values of "Hurub Hambangun Praja" (enthusiasm to build the country) are carried out by the musrenbang participants, fraud in budgeting can be prevented.

VI. Limitation

The limitations of this research include: 1) lack of access to information and data; 2) October to January is a busy time for musrenbang participants to complete the budgeting process and prepare inspection from both the Inspectorate and the BPK.

VII. Suggestion

Some suggestions that can be put forward are as follows:

- a. For next researchers
The next research can be carried out in other regions that have different characteristics
- b. For Regional Government
It is suggested that the regional government instill the values of "Hurub Hambangun Praja" in the community because there are still many people who do not understand the meaning and values of the Hurub Hambangun Praja. The values of Hurub Hambangun Praja are expected to inspire the musrenbang process and the life of the community.

REFERENCES

- Adams, Brian. 2004. *Public Meeting and the Democratic Process*, Jan/Feb 2004
- Alfina, U. (2015). *Nilai-Nilai Karakter Rela Berkorban Tokoh Arjuna Pada Pagelaran Wayang Kulit Dalam Cerita "Wahyu"*

- Makutho Romo*”(Analisis Isi Video Untuk Media Pembelajaran Ppkn) (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta).
- Barzelay, M. 1992.*Breaking Through Bureaucracy: an new vision for managing in government*.LA: University of California Press
- Callahan, Kathe.2002. The Utilization and Effectiveness of Citizen Advisory Committees in The Budget Process of Local Government. *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting and Financial Management*.14 (2) 295-319
- Cohen, S., dan R.Brand.1993.*Total Quality Management: a practical guide for the real world*.San Fransisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers.
- Ebdon,Carol.2002.Beyond the Public Hearing:Citizen Participation in the Local Government Budgeting Process, *Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting and Financial Management*.14 (2) 273-294.
- Edralin,J.S.1997.*The new local governance and capacity building: A strategic approach* . Regional Development Studies, Vol. 3
- Firsa, Alfi Zakiyah. (2015). “Implementasi Electronic Musyawarah Rencana Pembangunan E-Musrenbang Di Kota Surabaya (Studi Pada Badan Perencanaan Pembangunan Kota (BAPPEKO) Pemerintah Kota Surabaya).”*Jurnal Administrasi Publik* 4.2
- Hanida, R., Irawan, B., & Syamsurizaldi, S. I. P. 2015. *The Analysis Of Planning And Budgeting Policy For Making More Significant Local Government Planning Policy In Indonesia*, *Internationale Journal of Advances in Social science*
- Haryanto, 2008. *Perencanaan dan Penganggaran Daerah*, Edisi 1, Semarang: Badan Penerbit Universitas Diponegoro
- Ishardino, Wahyu. “Mengukur Tingkat Partisipasi Masyarakat Kota Bekasi Dalam Penyusunan APBD Melalui Pelaksanaan Musrenbang 2010.” *Jurnal FISIP: Kybernan* 2.2 (2012).
- Johnson, Carolina. “An Institutional Theory of Participatory Budgeting.”APSA 2014 Annual Meeting Paper. 2014.
- Kamayanti, Ari, 2016, *Metodologi Penelitian Kualitatif*, Edisi 1, Jakarta Selatan: Yayasan Rumah Peneleh
- Kuncoro, Mudarjad, 2012, *Perencanaan Daerah*, Jakarta: Salemba 4
- Laksono, Fia, 2017, Dimensi manajerial dan politik proses penyusunan dan penetapan anggaran pendapatan dan belanja daerah, Tesis Program Studi Magister Ilmu Administrasi Publik Kekhususan Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah Fakultas Ilmu Administrasi Universitas Brawijaya Malang.
- Layzer, Judith A. 2002. *Citizen Participation and Government Choice in Local Environmental Controversies*. *Policy Studies Journal*, Urbana: Vol.30, Iss.2
- Mardiono, Den B.I, 2014, *Napak Tilas Jejak-Jejak Kaki Wong Blitar Dari Masa ke Masa*, Edisi 2, Blitar; Blitar Heritage Society (BHS) Bersama Bappeda Kota Blitar.
- Nadhiroh, Laelatun. “Perwujudan Semboyan Hurub Hembang Praja Dalam Pembangunan Masyarakat Kabupaten Blitar.”SKRIPSI Jurusan Hukum dan Kewarganegaraan-Fakultas Ilmu Sosial UM 2016.2016 (2016).
- Navarro, Zander. 2002. *Dezentralization, Participation and Social Control of Public Resources : Participatory Budgeting in Porto Alegre, Brazil* dalam seminar: *Citizen Participation in the Context of Fiscal Decentralization: the Best*

- practices in Municipal Administration*,. Tokyo dan Kobe Jepang September 2002.
- Osborne, D. and Gaebler, T. 1992. *Reinventing Government*. Reading MA: Addison Wesley Longman, Inc.
- Peraturan Pemerintah Republik Indonesia Nomor 8 Tahun 2008 Tentang Tahapan, Tata Cara Penyusunan, Pengendalian dan Evaluasi Pelaksanaan Rencana Pembangunan Daerah
- Purba, R. E. 2011. *Public Participation in Development Planning: A Case Study of Indonesian Musrenbang*. International Journal of Interdisciplinary Social Sciences, 5(12)
- Setiabudi, Hery dkk., 2011. *Wong Blitar*, Jakarta; Pusat Studi Bung Karno
- Shah, Aand Shen C. 2007. *Citizen-Centric Performance Budgeting at the Local Level. Public Sector and Governance and Accountability Series: Local Budgeting*. World Bank.
- Supadmi, Utin Sri Ayu. "Pelaksanaan Hasil Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan (Musrenbang) Di Kecamatan Kapuas Kabupaten Sanggau." *Jurnal Program Magister Ilmu Sosial Universitas Tanjungpura* 1.0001 (2013).
- Sagadji, Eka Fathimin, 2015, *Faktor-Faktor Yang Mendorong Keberhasilan Implementasi E-Budgeting Pada Pemerintah Kota Surabaya*, Tesis Program Magister Akuntansi Pascasarjana Fakultas Ekonomi dan Bisnis Universitas Brawijaya Malang
- Sopannah, 2012, *Ceremonial Budgeting Dalam Perencanaan Penganggaran Daerah: Sebuah Keindahan Yang Menipu*, Simposium Nasional Akuntansi (SNA) 15 Banjarmasin
- Suwayono, Eko. *Rembug Anggaran Dalam Perencanaan Penganggaran Daerah: Gabug Utawi Sae-Saen (Studi Kasus Dalam Penganggaran Daerah Di Pemerintah Kabupaten Boyolali)*. Diss. Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta, 2014.
- Tuasikal, Askam. 2013. "Fenomenologis Perencanaan Dan Penganggaran Pemerintah Daerah." *Jurnal Akuntansi Universitas Jember* 11.2
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 17 Tahun 2003 Tentang Keuangan Negara
- Undang-Undang Republik Indonesia Nomor 25 Tahun 2004 Tentang Sistem Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional
- Wijayanti, Anita Wahyu, Mujibur Rahman Khairul Muluk, and Ratih Nurpratiwi. "Perencanaan Anggaran Berbasis Kinerja di Kabupaten Pasuruan." *Wacana, Jurnal Sosial dan Humaniora* 15.3 (2012): 10-17

