



COMMUNICATION IN THE VILLAGE DISTRICT SELECTION DELIBERATION IN DIMEMBE DISTRICT

Stefanus Ambow, Goinpeace H. Tumbel, Devie S.R. Siwij.

Universitas Negeri Manado, Indonesia

Corresponding email : Ambowsteven09@gmail.com

Received: 02/04/2026 | Revised: 04/05/2026 | Accepted: 20/05/2026 | Published: 11/06/2026

Abstract

The purpose of this study was to analyze the formal and informal communication patterns between the Village Consultative Body (BPD) and the Village Head (Uku Tua) in the implementation of the Pinilih Village Deliberation (Deliberation), as well as to analyze information transparency, community participation, and decision documentation in inter-institutional communication in the Village Deliberation. The method used was a descriptive qualitative approach with a case study design. Data collection was conducted through in-depth interviews, observation, and document studies, while data analysis followed the Miles and Huberman model. The results showed that formal and informal communication between the BPD and the Village Head (Uku Tua) was not yet balanced; informal communication via WhatsApp, telephone, and in-person meetings was more dominant, but did not leave administrative evidence, making it difficult to evaluate. Information transparency was still hampered by miscommunication on sensitive issues such as Direct Cash Assistance (Bantuan Langsung Tunai). Community participation was not optimal because some residents did not attend without clear reasons. Decision documentation in the form of minutes and minutes was available physically and digitally, but the quality of the content was not strong enough to provide a basis for accountability. Thus, the accountability of the Village Deliberation needs to be supported by a balance of formal and informal communication, greater transparency, equitable participation, and complete and orderly documentation.

Keywords: formal and informal communication, Village Deliberation, transparency, community participation, decision documentation, accountability.

INTRODUCTION

Village Deliberations (Deliberations) are one of the most fundamental democratic spaces in village governance. Philosophically, Village Deliberations are not merely interpreted as formal meeting forums, but as a manifestation of the democratic values of Pancasila, which place deliberation, consensus, togetherness, and community interests as the basis for public decision-making. In the context of village governance, deliberations serve as a means to reconcile diverse interests, absorb community aspirations, resolve differences of opinion, and formulate decisions concerning the direction of development and the welfare of village residents. Therefore, Village Deliberations have crucial ethical and social significance because the resulting decisions are not merely administrative in nature but also reflect the collective will of the village community (Ministry of Villages, Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration, 2019). Philosophically, the Village Deliberation reflects the view that village governance must be based on dialogue, openness, community participation, and respect for every citizen's aspirations. Therefore, the relationship between the village government and the community is not merely understood as a relationship of authority or power, but rather as a social bond built through trust, shared responsibility, and public accountability (Ministry of Villages, Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration, 2019). In the implementation of the Village Deliberation, the quality of communication is a key determinant of the meaningfulness of the deliberation forum itself. The deliberation should not be seen simply as a formal activity that produces minutes or decisions, but must be understood as a space for dialogue that allows the Village Consultative Body

(BPD), the Village Government, and the community to share opinions, reasons, and Open deliberation. If communication is two-way, equal, transparent, and documented, Village Deliberations can be a healthy deliberation space and reflect local democracy. However, if communication is mostly closed, one-way, unrecorded, or controlled by certain actors, the deliberation's value as a participatory and democratic forum has the potential to weaken (Ministry of Villages, Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration, 2019). Normatively, the Village Deliberation is understood as a deliberative forum that brings together the Village Consultative Body, the Village Government, and elements of the village community to discuss and agree on strategic issues in the implementation of village governance. In the context of this research, the Village Deliberation not only functions as an administrative agenda, but also as a space for public deliberation at the village level. This forum is a meeting place for the BPD as an institution that represents community aspirations with the Hukum Tua as the holder of village government authority to discuss, formulate, and determine important decisions, including the direction of village development planning and the preparation of the Village Budget (Republik Indonesia, 2014). Thus, the quality of the Village Deliberation is highly dependent on the quality of communication between the BPD and the Hukum Tua, because these two actors have a strategic position in connecting the interests of the village government, community aspirations, and village institutional decisions.

From a theoretical perspective, the communication phenomenon in Village Deliberations can be explained through organizational communication theory, governance theory, deliberative democracy theory, advocacy coalition framework theory, and compensatory informality theory. Organizational communication theory views communication as the process of creating, conveying, and exchanging messages within a system of interdependent relationships. Within the village government structure, the BPD and the Village Head Law are part of a unified system of governance. While the Village Head (Undang-Undang Tua) is responsible for village governance, development, community development, and community empowerment, the BPD (Regional Consultative Body) functions to discuss and agree on draft village regulations with the Village Head, accommodate and channel community aspirations, and oversee the Village Head's performance. These differing functions require clear, focused, and mutually supportive communication to ensure the Village Deliberation can be effective as a forum for discussing strategic village interests (Republic of Indonesia, 2014; Ministry of Villages, Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration, 2019).

In Village Deliberations, organizational communication serves more than just conveying technical information regarding the time, place, and agenda of activities. Communication also serves as a means of building shared understanding before the forum is held, managing differing views during the deliberation process, and disseminating decisions after the deliberation concludes. Therefore, communication between the BPD and the Village Head (UU Tua) needs to be understood in three stages: pre-deliberation, implementation, and post-deliberation. In the initial stage, communication is directed at developing the agenda, preparing materials, and gathering community aspirations. In the implementation stage, communication determines the quality of openness, dialogue, and achieving consensus. Meanwhile, in the final stage, communication plays a role in documenting decisions, disseminating deliberation results, and providing accountability to the community (Ministry of Villages, Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration, 2019).

However, empirical reality shows that communication in Village Deliberations (Deliberations) does not always run ideally. In this study, researchers will analyze communication between the BPD (Regional Consultative Body) and the Hukum Tua (Old Law) in Pinilih Village, which is quite intense, both through formal and informal channels. Before the deliberation is held, the Hukum Tua usually communicates first with the BPD Chair regarding the deliberation plan, agenda, time, and meeting materials. This communication is carried out face-to-face, by telephone, and via WhatsApp. The BPD also helps disseminate information to the community through representatives in each guard, guard heads, guard social groups, and WhatsApp groups. This situation indicates that informal communication plays a crucial role in accelerating coordination and facilitating the dissemination of information to the community. However, the intensity of informal communication also presents empirical problems. Communication via WhatsApp, telephone, or meetings outside of formal forums is considered effective for discussing urgent matters, providing clarification, and aligning initial perceptions between the BPD and the Hukum Tua. However, if informal communication is too dominant and not consistently reflected in official forums or formal documents, it risks creating accountability issues. Some important discussions can even be resolved through informal channels before being brought to the Village Deliberation. In the research document, informants explained that even if an issue has been agreed upon through informal communication between the BPD and the Hukum Tua, the issue is not always escalated to the formal forum, unless a consensus has not yet been reached. This suggests a tendency for informal communication to function not only as initial coordination but

also as a forum for resolving issues outside of formal deliberation mechanisms. This phenomenon is important to examine because the Village Deliberation (Musyawarah Desa) should be a forum for joint decision-making involving the BPD (Regional Consultative Body), the Village Government, and community elements. If some of the strategic discussion material is completed before the official forum takes place, the Village Deliberation (Musyawarah Desa) risks becoming merely a forum for ratifying previously established understandings between certain actors. This situation is not necessarily negative, as informal communication can indeed help accelerate decisions. problem solving. However, from a public accountability perspective, this situation requires criticism, as village decisions should not only be effective but also transparent, participatory, documented, and accountable to the community. Another empirical issue is the potential for miscommunication and differences in understanding between the BPD, the Village Head, and Village Consultative Assembly participants. In the research document, informants stated that differences of opinion often arise, especially during the deliberations. One example that emerged was in the discussion of potential recipients of Direct Cash Assistance, where each participant or representative had different proposals and interests. These differences then had to be managed through dialogue, clarification, and deliberation to reach consensus. This finding indicates that communication in Village Deliberations is not only technical, but also related to social interests, relationships between residents, and community trust in the village government. Based on the description of the problems above, this research is important to be carried out with the aim of analyzing formal and informal communication patterns between the BPD and the Village Head in the implementation of village deliberations , as well as analyzing information transparency, community participation, and decision documentation in inter-institutional communication in village deliberations.

METHOD

This research uses a descriptive qualitative approach with a case study design, which was chosen to explore in depth the formal and informal communication patterns between the Village Consultative Body (BPD) and the Village Head in the implementation of Village Deliberations, as well as the influence of inter-institutional communication on the accountability of deliberations as a complex social phenomenon. The research location was determined in Pinilih Village, Dimembe District, considering the dynamics of deliberations and relevant communication patterns. The research was conducted in March 2026. The research indicators consist of two main focuses: (1) Formal and Informal Communication Patterns between the BPD and the Village Head, which includes formal communication (invitations, agendas, minutes, minutes, documentation) and informal communication (face-to-face, telephone, WhatsApp, meetings outside of official forums); (2) Information Transparency, Community Participation, and Decision Documentation in inter-institutional communication, which includes information openness, citizen involvement in forums, and the completeness and orderliness of archives of deliberation results.

The data sources consist of primary and secondary data. Primary data were obtained through in-depth interviews with key informants, namely the Hukum Tua (Village Head), the BPD Chair, the Village Secretary, and the Head of General Affairs. Secondary data include village profiles, village structures, research-related articles, and regulations governing communication between the BPD and the Hukum Tua. The data collection technique used three complementary methods: (1) in-depth interviews to gather detailed information about the implementation process, field experiences, and informants' understanding; (2) direct observation of government work activities, coordination, and administrative practices; (3) document studies to examine objective secondary data that supports the findings from interviews and observations. These three methods were applied simultaneously to enable stronger and more accurate data triangulation. The data analysis technique follows the Miles and Huberman model, which includes: data collection, data condensation (selection, simplification, and transformation of data), data presentation in the form of narrative text and tables, as well as drawing conclusions and verification.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

1. Formal and Informal Communication Patterns Between the BPD and the Village Head in the Implementation of Village Deliberations

This research found that communication between the Village Consultative Body (BPD) and the Village Head in Pinilih Village occurs through two channels: formal and informal. In general, this communication is ongoing, but it is not yet fully balanced and well-documented.

1.1 Formal Communication Patterns

The research results indicate that formal communication patterns between the BPD and the Village Head in the implementation of Village Deliberations have been implemented, but are not yet fully established as a systematic institutional communication mechanism. Initial communication regarding the implementation of Village Deliberations, agenda preparation, and discussion of meeting materials is still conducted face-to-face, by telephone, and via WhatsApp. After an initial understanding is reached, the village government continues the process by issuing physical invitations to the BPD, village officials, and the community. Information on the implementation of Village Deliberations is also disseminated through WhatsApp groups, guard meetings, and representatives. BPD. Thus, formal communication has indeed been used, but the initial stages of communication still rely heavily on informal channels. These findings indicate that communication between the BPD and the Village Head has not been fully documented since the preparation stage. This preparatory stage is crucial for determining the quality of Village Deliberation implementation. If initial communication occurs only through face-to-face conversations, telephone calls, or WhatsApp messages without formal documentation, the process of determining the agenda, sharing information, and compiling meeting materials becomes difficult to trace.

Formal communication was evident through initial coordination, the creation of physical invitations, the distribution of invitations to the Village Consultative Body (BPD), village officials, and the community, and the implementation of the Village Deliberation forum itself. Furthermore, there was a mechanism for recording minutes in *real time*, reading the minutes after the deliberation, and sharing the results of the decisions via a WhatsApp group. However, the findings revealed significant weaknesses: the BPD could not provide a physical archive of the invitations, there was no summary of the initial coordination results, and written records of the deliberation preparations were unavailable.

Based on Goldhaber's (1993) organizational communication theory, formal communication should follow the organization's official channels, including message creation, exchange, and accountable documentation. In this study, formal communication's function as a control and accountability tool has not been optimal due to the lack of adequate administrative evidence. Robbins and Judge (2017) also emphasize that formal communication functions to control, motivate, convey information, and build social relationships within an organization. The lack of archives indicates a weak control function. From Habermas's (1996) perspective of deliberative democracy, the legitimacy of public decisions arises from an open, rational communication process free from domination. Unrecorded initial coordination can create the impression that the deliberation agenda is prepared solely by certain actors without any administrative trace, thus weakening the transparency and accountability of the deliberative process.

PDTT Ministerial Regulation Number 16 of 2019 concerning Village Deliberations confirms that Village Deliberations are a deliberative forum involving the BPD, village government, and elements of the village community to Discuss and agree on strategic matters. This regulation demonstrates that the Village Deliberation is not simply an administrative meeting, but rather a collective decision-making forum. Therefore, communication before, during, and after the Village Deliberation must be open, participatory, and documented. Siwij's (2022) research also relates to these findings. Siwij found that job satisfaction influences the work motivation of village officials. This finding is important because the quality of formal communication, including the preparation of invitations, information distribution, recording minutes, and document archiving are heavily influenced by the motivation and responsibility of village officials. If village officials lack administrative motivation, formal communication can simply function as a procedural routine without producing complete and informative documents. Therefore, communication issues in

This research also aligns with the findings of Kalesaran, Mandagi, and Tumbel (2023), who stated that village government administration still faces challenges in orderly recording and staff capacity. Thus, formal communication between the BPD and the Hukum Tua (Old Law) has occurred as a coordination practice, but it is not yet robust as an accountable administrative system. This research shows that inter-institutional communication, particularly between the Village Consultative Body (BPD) and the Village Head (UU Tua), is a crucial factor in ensuring that Village Deliberations are truly transparent, participatory, and accountable. Therefore, accountability is measured not only by the presence or absence of minutes and minutes, but also by how information is prepared, conveyed, understood, discussed, and acted upon.

1.2 Informal Communication Patterns

The research results show that informal communication between the Village Consultative Body (BPD) and the Village Head (UU Tua) plays a significant role in the implementation of Village Deliberations (Deliberations). This communication occurs intensively through various easy-to-use media, such as WhatsApp, telephone, and in-person

meetings outside of formal forums. This type of communication is considered helpful because it is faster, more flexible, and less tied to formal procedures. In practice, informal communication is often used to discuss deliberation preparations, align initial perspectives, determine the timing of the meeting, and discuss technical matters before the official forum is held. However, research findings also reveal a fundamental problem. Informal communication is not only used for technical purposes, but in some circumstances has become a space for initial agreements between the BPD and the Village Head. In fact, during incidental Village Deliberations, certain discussions are held. Issues tend to be resolved through informal communication before being brought to the formal forum. This situation suggests that informal communication does facilitate coordination, but at the same time, it can displace the Village Deliberation's function as a forum for collective discussion. The Village Deliberation, which should be a deliberative forum, has the potential to become merely a place to ratify or confirm decisions previously discussed in limited detail. This problem is exacerbated by the lack of adequate administrative evidence in informal communication. WhatsApp conversations cannot be retrieved because they are deleted or never printed. Telephone communications also lack written records. Meanwhile, in-person meetings held during community social activities, such as social gatherings (arisan), thanksgiving gatherings, or funerals, are not recorded. As a result, informal communication processes are difficult to evaluate and cannot be traced administratively. In the context of Village Deliberation accountability, this situation poses a weakness because there is no evidence to explain how an initial agreement was formed.

These findings demonstrate that informal communication has two sides. On the one hand, informal communication is a very helpful tool for the working relationship between the BPD and the Hukum Tua. In village government life, institutional relationships are often inseparable from everyday social interactions. Village actors live in the same social space, know each other, and frequently meet in community activities. Therefore, informal communication is a natural and difficult to avoid. Through informal communication, information can be delivered more quickly, technical issues can be discussed immediately, and coordination between the BPD and the Village Head becomes easier. However, on the other hand, informal communication can be problematic when used to discuss substantive matters that should be decided in a formal forum. If important agreements are reached before the Village Deliberation is held, the space for community participation can be limited. Deliberation participants are still present, but their position is potentially limited to receiving information, rather than participating in discussions and influencing decisions. In such situations, the Village Deliberation loses some of its meaning as an open, participatory, and accountable forum for deliberation.

Informal communication between the BPD and the Hukum Tua (Old Law) is very intensive through various channels, such as face-to-face meetings, telephone calls, WhatsApp, meetings at social gatherings (arisan), thanksgiving gatherings, and funerals in the village. Findings indicate that informal communication is used to discuss deliberation preparations, agree on agendas, clarify information, and even resolve strategic issues before the official forum is held. Some incidental issues are resolved directly through informal channels without being brought to the Village Deliberation. However, this informal communication has a serious weakness: it leaves no administrative evidence. WhatsApp conversations are deleted or never printed, phone calls lack written records, and in-person meetings during social events are not recorded. As a result, informal communication processes are difficult to evaluate and cannot be traced back. According to Goldhaber (1993), informal communication networks emerge due to practical needs, personal closeness, and the need for rapid problem-solving. In this study, informal communication served the function of conveying information and strengthening social relationships. However, the control and accountability functions, as described by Robbins and Judge (2017), were not implemented due to a lack of documentation.

From the perspective of *the compensatory informality theory* proposed by Hendra, Prasoj, and Fathurrahman (2026), informal communication becomes crucial when formal mechanisms are unable to meet the need for speed and coordination. However, the dominance of informal communication can undermine accountability if it is not returned to formal mechanisms. This research reinforces this view: informal communication is beneficial but should not replace formal forums. Siwij's (2022) research on the influence of job satisfaction on the work motivation of village officials in Pineleng District is also relevant to explain these findings. Siwij demonstrated that village officials' work motivation influences the performance of their duties. In the context of this research, the weak recording of informal communication is not only related to procedures, but also to officials' motivation, discipline, and awareness of the importance of documentation. If officials or related parties have strong administrative awareness, informal communication concerning Village Deliberations can still be recorded in the form of coordination summaries or simple digital archives.

The results of this study support the research objective. If the research objective is to analyze informal communication patterns between the BPD and the Village Consultative Body (UU Tua) in the implementation of Village Deliberations,

the research findings indicate that informal communication is indeed a crucial part of the process. Informal communication helps expedite coordination, facilitates information exchange, and strengthens working relationships between the BPD and the UU Tua. However, this study also found that informal communication has serious weaknesses because it is undocumented, difficult to evaluate, and has the potential to precede formal forums.

1.3 Balance between Formal and Informal Communication

The research results show that the balance between formal and informal communication is not yet balanced. Informal communication is more dominant in forming initial understandings, but these agreements are not always brought back to formal forums and are not documented. Consequently, Village Deliberations risk becoming a venue for limited validation of previously made decisions. On the other hand, procedurally, the Village Deliberation continues: there is an official forum, point-by-point discussions, minutes are taken, read, and the results are disseminated. Disagreements between the Village Head and the Village Consultative Body (BPD) Chairperson still occur, particularly on sensitive issues such as recipients of Direct Cash Assistance (BLT). This indicates that space for dialogue remains open, but the quality of deliberation is diminished because the direction of decisions has already been determined. Habermas (1996) emphasized that the legitimacy of public decisions must be established through rational communication in an equal public space. If initial understanding is too strong before the forum, the deliberation process becomes less transparent. Cohen (1989) and Gutmann & Thompson (2004) also emphasize the importance of a free and equal exchange of reasons. This study found that the dominance of informal communication hinders the achievement of this principle.

Regulations from the Minister of Villages, Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration (Permendesa PDTT) Number 16 of 2019 state that Village Deliberations are held by the Village Consultative Body (BPD) to discuss strategic matters. The BPD is tasked with preparing the forum, disseminating information, accommodating aspirations, and expressing views in minutes. Therefore, informal communication should not replace formal forums. In village governance practices, both formal and informal communication are equally necessary. Formal communication is important because it relates to procedures, authority, record-keeping, and accountability. Meanwhile, informal communication is necessary because social relationships between village actors are typically close, rapid, and cannot always be limited by formal correspondence mechanisms. Problems arise when informal communication no longer plays a supporting role but begins to replace formal communication in shaping decision-making. At this point, the communication balance is disrupted.

This research also aligns with Dwinarko (2023), who stated that organizational communication is the foundation of the partnership between the BPD and the Village Head, but this partnership must produce accountable documents. The practical implication is that any informal communication discussing strategic agendas should be summarized in writing and presented to a formal forum to maintain communication balance. The practical implication of these findings is the need for a simple mechanism to integrate informal communication into official Village Deliberation documents. Every informal communication discussing the agenda, proposed priorities, basis for consideration, differences of opinion, or initial understandings should be documented with a brief note. This note should include the time of the communication, the parties involved, the topic of discussion, and any issues that need to be brought to the official forum. This way, informal communication can still be used as a means of rapid coordination without being removed from the accountability system.

Based on overall discussion, can confirmed that the balance between formal and informal communication in Village Deliberation decision-making is not yet fully proportional. Formal communication has been carried out through deliberation forums, recording minutes, reading out results, deliberations for consensus, and dissemination of decisions to the community. However, communication informal still too dominant In forming initial understandings, these have not been well documented. Therefore, the necessary improvement is not to eliminate informal communication, but rather to organize it so that the results of informal communication can be incorporated into formal mechanisms. This way, Village Deliberations can proceed quickly and flexibly.

2. Information Transparency, Community Participation, and Decision Documentation in Inter-Institutional Communication in Village Deliberations

2.1 Information Transparency

Transparency of information in Village Deliberations has begun to be evident in the availability of minutes, minutes, and digital archives that can be used for clarification, including during inspections by the Inspectorate. Discussions are conducted point by point, and two-way communication occurs between the deliberation leaders and participants. However, transparency is not yet fully implemented, as miscommunication often occurs, especially on

sensitive issues like direct cash assistance (BLT). Differences of opinion arise from community ignorance, personal interests, and a lack of transparency regarding budget information. According to Goldhaber (1993), organizational communication must enable the exchange of clear messages within a network of interdependent relationships. Robbins and Judge (2017) added that the information function in communication must be supported by message clarity. In this finding, digital minutes and archives are helpful, but not sufficient to overcome miscommunication because the substance of the information is not fully understood by the public. Habermas (1996) emphasized that the legitimacy of public decisions arises from an open, rational communication process free from domination. Differences of opinion in the discussion of direct cash assistance (BLT) should be part of the argumentation process, but if they arise from ignorance or weak explanations, the quality of deliberation decreases. Regulation of the Minister of Villages, Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration No. 16 of 2019 requires the Village Consultative Body (BPD) to disseminate information on deliberation materials, collect aspirations, and document them in minutes. Therefore, transparency is not merely about making documents available; it must be accessible and understandable to the public. Research by Rofiah, Suryawati, and Rohman (2023) confirms that transparency in Village Fund management requires public communication, information accessibility, and clear documentation. These findings align: although digital archives facilitate clarification with the Inspectorate, the public still experiences miscommunication due to inadequate information dissemination prior to the forum. Consequently, transparency needs to be strengthened on sensitive issues by openly explaining criteria, data, verification, and determination mechanisms.

2.2 Community Participation

Community participation in Village Deliberations (Deliberations) is suboptimal. Although communication between the BPD Chair and the Village Head (Uku Tua) runs smoothly, not all community members are present and involved. According to informants, absences are mostly due to personal reasons. While informal communication is effective for initial coordination, it cannot replace formal forums, as they are the primary forum for decision-making for the common good. Arnstein (1969), in his theory of citizen participation, explains that participation has levels, from symbolic to empowering. In this study, Village Deliberations provide a formal space, but community participation is not evenly distributed, resulting in low levels of participation. Habermas (1996) emphasizes that the legitimacy of public decisions must be established through rational, equal communication. If informal communication is too dominant, the space for community participation is reduced because decisions are pre-formed.

From a *governance perspective*, Rhodes (1996) stated that good governance involves a network of actors and interactions between the government and the public. Waldo (1948) also emphasized that public administration embodies the values of democracy and participation. These findings indicate that public participation is determined not only by good relationships between institutions, but also by public communication strategies that can reach a wide range of citizens. Regulation of the Minister of Villages, Development of Disadvantaged Regions and Transmigration No. 16 of 2019 stipulates that Village Deliberation participants consist of the Village Government, the Village Consultative Body (BPD), and officially invited community members. Community attendance is not an additional element, but rather a crucial one. Research by Hendrawati and Pramudianti (2020) and Prabowo et al. (2025) also shows that participation in village planning must be supported by document transparency and a space for expressing opinions. Consequently, the BPD and the Village Head need to conduct initial outreach, explain the agenda and the importance of attendance, and ensure that community aspirations are truly considered in decisions.

2.3 Decision Documentation

Documentation of decisions in Village Deliberations has been carried out, but its quality still needs to be strengthened. The Village Secretary is tasked with archiving minutes, minutes of meetings, attendance lists, and photos of activities, both manually and digitally. There have been no instances of archive loss. However, the existing documentation is not yet robust enough because it still gives rise to differing understandings and decisions are subject to further debate by the community. Minutes do not always include the basis for consideration, discussion process, reasons for decisions, verification mechanisms, and follow-up. According to Goldhaber (1993), organizational communication requires the creation and exchange of documented messages. Robbins and Judge (2017) emphasize that communication has a control function that can only operate if there are auditable records. These findings indicate that even though physical and digital archives are available, the quality of the document content remains weak, resulting in suboptimal control and accountability functions. Habermas (1996) emphasized that the legitimacy of public decisions requires a record of the deliberation process. Detailed minutes are essential to demonstrate that decisions are born from an exchange of opinions, not simply the final outcome. Rhodes (1996), in his theory of *governance*, states that documentation serves

as a bridge between institutional coordination and the community. Weak documentation makes village governance vulnerable to miscommunication and low public trust.

Regulations from the Minister of Villages, Disadvantaged Regions, and Transmigration (Permendesa PDDT) No. 16 of 2019 require the Village Consultative Body (BPD) to record aspirations in an aspiration book and express official views in minutes. Law No. 3 of 2024 (an amendment to Law No. 6 of 2014) also emphasizes the importance of accountable, transparent, and orderly village governance. Research by Kalesaran, Mandagi, and Tumbel (2023) and Siwij (2022) shows that the quality of village administration is highly dependent on the motivation, discipline, and capacity of the apparatus. Research by Rofiah, Suryawati, and Rohman (2023) adds that transparency requires clarity in budget documents and processes. Practical implications: The format of minutes needs to be improved to include the discussion process, participant proposals, responses, disagreements, the basis for decisions, and follow-up. Digital archiving needs to be more systematic, and training for the Village Consultative Body (BPD) and village officials in preparing accountable deliberation documents is required.

CONCLUSION

1. Formal and informal communication patterns between the Village Consultative Body (BPD) and the Village Head (UU Tua) in the implementation of Village Deliberations (Musyawarah Tua) are not yet fully balanced and well documented. Formal communication is evident through invitations, Village Deliberation forums, minutes, minutes, and the determination of decision results, but remains weak because initial coordination is not always recorded, agendas and discussion materials are not evenly distributed, and participants do not fully receive substantive information before the forum takes place. Meanwhile, informal communication through face-to-face meetings, telephone, WhatsApp, the head of duty, and BPD representatives is very helpful in accelerating coordination and problem solving, but if too dominant can shift the function of the Village Deliberation from a space for joint discussion to a space for confirmation of previous agreements. This study shows that formal and informal communication are both used, but need to be balanced to ensure the communication process remains fast, open, documented, and accountable.
2. Inter-institutional communication in Village Deliberations is not yet fully established, as information transparency, community participation, and decision documentation still need improvement. Minutes and minutes do not always include the basis for consideration, discussion process, and reasons. decisions, as well as verification mechanisms, especially on sensitive issues such as determination recipient Direct Cash Assistance (BLT). Besides That, Still There is public who does not present without known the cause in a way clear, And although While physical and digital archives are readily available, the quality of the document content is not yet strong enough to provide a basis for clarification and accountability. Research shows that Village Deliberation accountability must be supported by transparent communication, equitable participation, and complete, orderly, and easily verifiable decision documentation.

REFERENCES

- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A ladder of citizen participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216–224.
- Cohen, J. (1989). Deliberation and democratic legitimacy. In A. Hamlin & P. Pettit (Eds.), *The good polity: Normative analysis of the state* (pp. 17–34). Blackwell.
- Dwinarko. (2023). *Komunikasi organisasi pada kemitraan Badan Permusyawaratan Desa dengan Kepala Desa dalam musyawarah pembangunan di Ponggang Kecamatan Serangpanjang Kabupaten Subang* [Skripsi atau tesis tidak dipublikasikan – detail dari tesis asli].
- Goldhaber, G. M. (1993). *Organizational communication* (6th ed.). McGraw-Hill.
- Gutmann, A., & Thompson, D. (2004). *Why deliberative democracy?* Princeton University Press.
- Habermas, J. (1996). *Between facts and norms: Contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy*. MIT Press.
- Hendra, O., Prasajo, E., & Fathurrahman, R. (2026). Compensatory informality: How informal networks enable and constrain formal public sector bureaucracy. *Australian Journal of Public Administration*.
- Hendrawati, E., & Pramudianti, M. (2020). Partisipasi, transparansi dan akuntabilitas perencanaan dan penganggaran Dana Desa. *Jurnal Riset Akuntansi Kontemporer*, 12(2), 100–108.
- Kalesaran, R. J., Mandagi, M., & Tumbel, G. (2023). Implementasi administrasi pemerintahan desa di Desa Pineleng Satu Timur Kecamatan Pineleng Kabupaten Minahasa. *Jurnal Ilmu Sosial dan Pendidikan (JISIP)*, 7(1), 352–357.

Kementerian Desa, Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal, dan Transmigrasi Republik Indonesia. (2019). *Peraturan Menteri Desa, Pembangunan Daerah Tertinggal, dan Transmigrasi Nomor 16 Tahun 2019 tentang Musyawarah Desa*. Jakarta: Kementerian Desa PDTT.

Prabowo, J. D. E., Sakti, M. F. D., Romdoni, S., Sumarsono, M. M., & Yuningsih, N. Y. (2025). Peran musyawarah desa dalam pengambilan keputusan keuangan desa: Studi kasus Desa Sukadana. *Jurnal Review Pendidikan dan Pengajaran*, 8(2), 6390–6401.

Republik Indonesia. (2014). *Undang-Undang Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 tentang Desa*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2014 Nomor 7. Jakarta: Sekretariat Negara.

Republik Indonesia. (2024). *Undang-Undang Nomor 3 Tahun 2024 tentang Perubahan Kedua atas Undang-Undang Nomor 6 Tahun 2014 tentang Desa*. Lembaran Negara Republik Indonesia Tahun 2024 Nomor ... Jakarta: Sekretariat Negara.

Rhodes, R. A. W. (1996). The new governance: Governing without government. *Political Studies*, 44(4), 652–667.

Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2017). *Organizational behavior* (17th ed.). Pearson.

Rofiah, Suryawati, & Rohman. (2023). Dimensi-dimensi dalam membangun transparansi pengelolaan Dana Desa. [Nama jurnal tidak disebut dalam naskah – dapat ditambahkan jika tersedia].

Siwij, D. S. R. (2022). Pengaruh kepuasan kerja terhadap motivasi kerja perangkat desa se-Kecamatan Pineleng. *Jurnal Ilmiah Wahana Pendidikan*, 8(22), 140–146.

Sugiyono. (2022). *Metode penelitian kualitatif*. Bandung: Alfabeta

Waldo, D. (1948). *The administrative state: A study of the political theory of American public administration*. Ronald Press.