



Exploring Lived Experiences of Power Negotiation in Everyday Local Governance in Indonesian Village Administration

Mukhlis Lubis ^{1*}, Setiadi ²

¹Sekolah Tinggi Agama Islam Negeri Mandailing Natal, Indonesia

²Universitas Islam Negeri Sunan Gunung Djati Bandung, Indonesia

¹mukhlis@gmail.com *, ²Setiadi@gmail.com

Article Info

Article history:

Received 30-01-2026

Revised 05-03-2026

Accepted 17-03-2026

Keyword:

Lived Experience; Power Negotiation; Local Governance; Everyday Politics; Political Sociology; Street-Level Bureaucracy

ABSTRACT

Political sociology has long examined power and governance through institutional structures and policy mechanisms that shape state–society relations. More recent scholarship has increasingly recognized the importance of everyday governance, where local officials operate at the frontline and translate formal authority into lived practice. However, limited attention has been given to how these officials experience and make meaning of power in their daily interactions with citizens, leaving unanswered the question of how power is subjectively negotiated in local governance contexts. Here, an interpretative phenomenological approach is employed to explore how local officials experience, interpret, and negotiate power between state demands and community expectations. Data were generated through in-depth, semi-structured interviews with frontline local officials and analyzed using Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis to capture essential meanings embedded in lived experience. The findings indicate that local officials experience power as a dynamic, relational, and morally embedded process rather than a fixed institutional resource. Participants reported persistent ethical tensions between bureaucratic compliance and community responsiveness, frequent reliance on informal negotiation strategies to resolve conflicts, and the strategic cultivation of trust as a key mechanism for maintaining legitimacy and administrative effectiveness. These results suggest that governance operates as a situated and ethically mediated practice shaped by interpersonal interaction and contextual judgment. By foregrounding lived experience, this study demonstrates that phenomenological inquiry reveals dimensions of power obscured by structural and policy-centered analyses, thereby offering practical insights for designing more responsive and trust-based governance frameworks.



©2026 Authors. Published by PT Mukhlisina Revolution Center.. This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0 International License. (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

INTRODUCTION

Power and governance have long occupied a central position in political sociology, particularly in efforts to understand how authority is exercised, maintained, and contested within society (Makinara et al., 2025). Classical and contemporary scholarship has examined governance primarily through institutional arrangements, legal frameworks, and policy mechanisms that structure relations between the state and citizens. Within this tradition, local governance is often portrayed as a key arena where state authority becomes visible and operationalized through bureaucratic roles, administrative procedures, and regulatory practices (Chen & Jiang, 2025). As a result, governance at the local level is commonly understood as an extension of formal state power embedded in organizational rules and administrative hierarchies.

Despite these structural accounts, everyday governance unfolds within complex social and cultural contexts where formal authority intersects with local norms, moral expectations, and interpersonal relationships (Yasih, 2025). Local government officials operate at the frontline of state–society interaction, mediating between institutional demands and the lived realities of citizens. In this setting, power is not only enacted through written regulations or official mandates, but also through

communication, negotiation, and situational judgment (Mattes et al., 2024). Prior studies on street-level bureaucracy highlight that governance practices are deeply shaped by discretion, interpretation, and moral reasoning exercised by frontline actors in response to concrete human situations.

The relevance of this phenomenon extends beyond administrative efficiency or policy implementation. Power, as experienced in everyday governance, directly affects how individuals perceive legitimacy, justice, and trust in public institutions (Mukhlis, 2025a; Mukhlis & Saidah, 2025). For local officials, governance is often accompanied by ethical tension, emotional burden, and the need to balance competing expectations from the state and the community (Harida, 2025). These experiences reveal governance as a human practice, embedded in subjective perceptions and lived encounters, rather than a purely technical or procedural activity. Understanding these dimensions is essential for grasping how power is sustained, challenged, or transformed in daily social life.

However, much of the existing literature continues to privilege macro-level explanations and institutional analyses, leaving limited space for exploring how power is experienced and made meaningful by those who enact it (Miao & Yang, 2024). Although scholars acknowledge the importance of discretion and moral reasoning, relatively few studies position lived experience as the primary unit of analysis. Instead, subjective elements are frequently treated as explanatory variables within broader structural models rather than as phenomena requiring in-depth interpretative exploration. This gap points to the need for an approach that foregrounds subjective experience and captures the meanings that actors assign to their roles and actions. A phenomenological perspective offers a valuable lens for addressing this need, as it centers on lived experience and seeks to illuminate how social phenomena are perceived, interpreted, and negotiated in everyday contexts (Wallace & Smith, 2024). By focusing on meaning rather than structure alone, phenomenology enables a deeper understanding of governance as it is lived and experienced by local actors within their specific social worlds.

In recent decades, research focusing on the lived experiences of social and political actors has gained increasing attention within political sociology and governance studies (Brännlund & Rapeli, 2025). Scholars have begun to recognize that understanding how power is enacted requires more than examining institutional structures or policy outcomes; it also demands close attention to how actors experience authority, responsibility, and constraint in their everyday roles. Studies on street-level bureaucracy and frontline governance have demonstrated that officials' perceptions, moral reasoning, and situational judgments significantly shape how governance is practiced on the ground. This growing body of work underscores the importance of subject-centered inquiry in revealing dimensions of power that remain invisible in structural or macro-level analyses.

Despite this progress, exploring subjective experience in governance research presents substantial methodological challenges. Much of the existing literature relies on quantitative indicators, surveys, or institutional datasets that prioritize measurable outcomes over lived meaning. While such approaches are valuable for identifying patterns and correlations, they often lack the depth required to capture how actors internally interpret their roles, navigate ethical dilemmas, and make sense of conflicting demands (Mukhlis, Arifin, Ridwan, & Zulbaidah, 2025; Mukhlis, Arifin, Ridwan, Zulbaidah, et al., 2025). Even qualitative studies in governance frequently adopt descriptive or case-based approaches that focus on organizational processes, leaving the experiential dimension of power underexplored. As a result, the voices of local officials are often filtered through analytical categories that obscure the richness of their subjective experiences.

These methodological limitations have constrained the field's ability to fully grasp the essence of power as it is lived in everyday governance. Approaches that treat power primarily as a structural resource or administrative function tend to overlook how it is felt, negotiated, and morally interpreted by those who enact it (Erdmenger, 2023). Consequently, existing methods have proven insufficient for illuminating the experiential foundations of governance practices, particularly in contexts where formal authority intersects with social relationships and ethical judgment. This shortcoming highlights the need for a research approach capable of accessing deeper layers of meaning and experience an orientation that aligns closely with phenomenological inquiry.

Within studies of local governance and power relations, prevailing responses to the complexities of frontline administration have largely relied on established practical and analytical approaches, such as institutional analysis, policy evaluation, and performance-based governance frameworks (Nasreldein et al., 2025). These approaches have been instrumental in explaining how rules are designed, how authority is distributed, and how compliance is monitored within administrative systems. In the context of street-level governance, such frameworks often emphasize efficiency, accountability, and procedural consistency as solutions to the challenges faced by local officials.

However, these dominant approaches exhibit significant limitations when applied to the exploration of lived experience and meaning (Datta-Roy et al., 2025). By privileging formal structures and observable outcomes, they tend to overlook how local officials internally experience power, interpret moral dilemmas, and negotiate conflicting expectations in everyday practice (Shao & Li, 2025). Quantitative indicators and policy-oriented analyses are particularly limited in capturing emotional tension, ethical reasoning, and situational judgment, all of which shape governance in subtle but consequential ways (Mukhlis et al., 2024; Mukhlis, Maryam, et al., 2023). As a result, existing explanations often provide a functional account of governance while leaving its experiential foundations insufficiently understood.

Taken together, these observations reveal a clear research gap: while prior studies have documented the discretionary practices of street-level officials and the structural dimensions of local governance, there remains a lack of in-depth phenomenological investigation into how power is consciously experienced, interpreted, and morally negotiated by local officials themselves. Existing research explains what officials do and how governance systems function, but it provides limited insight into how power is subjectively lived and made meaningful in everyday encounters. This absence weakens the theoretical linkage between structural accounts of governance and the human experiences that sustain them.

This gap points to the need for an alternative approach capable of accessing the essence of power as it is lived and made meaningful by those who enact it (Sahara & Suriyani, 2024). A phenomenological method offers such a pathway by centering inquiry on subjective experience and the meanings embedded in everyday action (Masum & Parker, 2024). Through systematic engagement with participants' narratives, phenomenology enables a holistic exploration of how power is perceived, negotiated, and ethically interpreted within specific social contexts. Despite its relevance, phenomenology remains underutilized in political sociology and governance research, particularly in studies of local officials (Macdonald et al., 2024). Addressing this gap by adopting a phenomenological perspective is essential for advancing a deeper and more nuanced understanding of governance as a lived social phenomenon.

Previous studies in political sociology and governance have examined power primarily through institutional arrangements, policy implementation, and administrative structures. Research on street-level bureaucracy has demonstrated that frontline officials exercise discretion and moral judgment in responding to citizens' needs (Couto et al., 2021). These studies provide important insights into how governance functions in practice, yet they often treat experience as a secondary element rather than a central object of inquiry (Ratmono et al., 2021). As a result, the subjective meanings that officials attach to power, authority, and responsibility remain only partially explored. Building directly on these studies, the present research shifts the analytical focus from discretionary action as an observable practice to power as a lived and interpreted experience. In doing so, it extends existing scholarship by offering an experiential account that complements and deepens structural and institutional explanations of governance.

To address this limitation, the study adopts an interpretative phenomenological approach to explore how local officials experience and make sense of power in their everyday governance practices (Andrade-Suárez & Caamaño-Franco, 2020). This approach is particularly suited to uncovering meanings that emerge through lived encounters, ethical tension, and relational negotiation. By focusing on participants' narratives, the study responds directly to the gap identified in previous research regarding the lack of experiential insight (McDermott et al., 2025). Phenomenology allows

the essence of negotiated power to be examined as it is lived rather than assumed. In doing so, the study offers a deeper and more holistic understanding of governance as a human practice.

The article is structured to guide readers systematically through this inquiry. The introduction outlines the theoretical and experiential context of power and governance and identifies the knowledge gap addressed by the study (Magnusson et al., 2025). The method section explains the phenomenological approach, participant selection, data collection, and analytic process (Mukhlis, Janwari, et al., 2023; Mukhlis & Abdullah, 2025). The results section presents thematically organized findings grounded in participants' lived experiences, followed by a discussion that situates these findings within existing scholarship. The article concludes by summarizing the key contributions and outlining implications for future research.

RESEARCH METHODS

Study Design

This study employed a phenomenological research design to explore the lived experiences of local government officials in negotiating power within everyday governance practices. Phenomenology was selected as it enables an in-depth examination of how individuals experience, interpret, and assign meaning to social phenomena as they are lived, rather than as they are formally structured or institutionally prescribed (Lutz & Knox, 2014; McNabb, 2015). This approach is particularly relevant for investigating power and governance at the grassroots level, where meaning emerges through daily interactions, moral judgment, and situational decision-making.

The study was grounded in an interpretative phenomenological perspective, informed by Heideggerian philosophy, which emphasizes understanding experiences as they are embedded in social, historical, and relational contexts. Rather than bracketing prior knowledge entirely, this perspective allows for interpretive engagement with participants' narratives to illuminate how power is experienced and negotiated in practice (Hillman & Radel, 2018; Migdal, 2018). This design facilitated a nuanced exploration of governance as a lived process shaped by ethical dilemmas, informal practices, and relational dynamics between state actors and citizens.

Given the idiographic orientation of interpretative phenomenology, the study prioritized analytic depth over statistical representation; therefore, the design was intended to generate nuanced, context-bound insights rather than broadly generalizable claims.

Participants

Participants consisted of local government officials operating at the frontline of state–society interaction (Carreiras & Castro, 2012; Iosifides, 2016). These individuals were directly involved in implementing policies, managing public services, and engaging with community members on a daily basis. Participants were selected using a purposive sampling approach to ensure relevance to the phenomenon under investigation.

Inclusion criteria required participants to (1) hold formal positions within local governance structures, (2) possess direct responsibility for interacting with citizens, and (3) have a minimum of two years of professional experience in their current role to ensure sufficient exposure to governance-related power dynamics. Individuals whose roles were exclusively administrative and did not involve interaction with the public were excluded.

The final sample comprised six participants, representing diverse roles within local governance. Participants varied in age, professional background, and length of service, providing a rich contextual foundation for understanding variations in lived experiences while maintaining analytic depth consistent with phenomenological inquiry.

Data Collection

Data were collected through in-depth, semi-structured interviews designed to elicit detailed narratives of participants' experiences with power negotiation in everyday governance. An interview

guide was used to ensure consistency across interviews while allowing flexibility for participants to elaborate on experiences they perceived as meaningful. Interview questions focused on daily governance practices, encounters with citizens, moral challenges, and strategies used to navigate institutional demands.

Interviews were conducted face-to-face in locations chosen to ensure privacy and comfort, such as participants' offices or neutral meeting spaces. Each interview lasted between 60 and 90 minutes and was audio-recorded with participants' consent (Fife, 2020; Kawamura, 2020). A supportive and non-judgmental environment was maintained to encourage open reflection and candid expression. Field notes were taken to capture contextual observations and non-verbal cues that complemented the verbal data.

Data Analysis

Data analysis followed the principles of Interpretative Phenomenological Analysis (IPA), emphasizing both descriptive engagement with participants' accounts and interpretative exploration of underlying meanings. Audio recordings were transcribed verbatim, and transcripts were read repeatedly to achieve immersion in the data.

Analysis proceeded through several systematic stages. First, significant statements reflecting participants' experiences of power and governance were identified and coded (Daly, 2007; Longhofer et al., 2012). These meaning units were then examined for patterns and relationships, leading to the development of emergent themes. Subsequently, themes were refined through comparative analysis across cases to identify shared structures of experience while preserving individual contextual nuances.

The analytic process moved iteratively from descriptive accounts toward higher-level interpretative insights, allowing essential meanings of negotiated power to emerge. Qualitative data analysis software (NVivo) was used to support data organization and coding, though interpretive decisions remained grounded in close engagement with the textual data.

As an additional methodological note, the analytic claims are positioned as interpretive and context-sensitive; therefore, conclusions are framed in terms of how negotiated power is experienced within the studied local governance setting, not as universal patterns applicable to all administrative environments.

RESULTS

Experiencing Power as a Continuous Negotiation Rather Than Formal Authority

Participants consistently described power not as a fixed authority derived solely from formal positions or regulations, but as a fluid and negotiated process embedded in daily interactions with citizens. Rather than perceiving themselves as unilateral decision-makers, local officials experienced power as something that must be constantly adjusted, balanced, and renegotiated in response to social realities.

One participant articulated this experience clearly:

“On paper, the authority is very clear. But in practice, power only works if people accept it. If they don't, you have to find another way to approach them.” (Participant 3)

This account demonstrates that formal authority alone is insufficient to generate compliance or legitimacy. Instead, power becomes effective only when mediated through dialogue, persuasion, and adaptive strategies.

This narrative reveals that formal power alone was insufficient to ensure compliance or legitimacy. Instead, participants emphasized the importance of relational strategies, such as dialogue, persuasion, and compromise, to maintain governance effectiveness. Power was thus experienced as situational and relational, shaped by ongoing encounters rather than institutional mandates.

Another participant reflected:

“Sometimes you have the authority, but you cannot use it directly. You must read the situation, understand the people, and decide when to act and when to hold back.” (Participant 1)

These accounts suggest that governance at the grassroots level is lived as an adaptive practice, where power emerges through negotiation rather than enforcement.

Power as Continuous Negotiation



Moral Dilemmas Between Bureaucratic Rules and Human Considerations

A central experience shared by participants was the presence of persistent moral tension between adhering to formal regulations and responding to the lived realities of citizens. Participants frequently described moments in which strict compliance with policy conflicted with their personal sense of fairness or empathy.

One participant explained:

“I often feel trapped between the rules and my conscience. The regulation says no, but the situation of the people makes it very difficult to say no.” (Participant 5)

This statement illustrates that governance is experienced as an ethical negotiation, not merely a technical implementation of policy.

This dilemma was not described as an occasional challenge, but as a recurring feature of everyday governance. Participants experienced themselves as moral agents who must interpret rules rather than simply apply them mechanically.

Another participant noted:

“If I only follow the rules, I may be safe administratively, but socially I will lose trust. And without trust, governance does not work.” (Participant 2)

These narratives illustrate how local officials experience governance as an ethical practice, requiring constant judgment and moral reflection. The experience of power is therefore inseparable from responsibility, emotional burden, and ethical uncertainty.

Informal Strategies as Essential Tools of Governance

Beyond formal procedures, participants highlighted the importance of informal strategies in managing governance processes. These strategies included personal communication, leveraging social relationships, and using culturally appropriate approaches to resolve conflicts or implement decisions.

One participant described this practice as follows:

“Sometimes the formal process creates resistance. So we approach community leaders informally first, explain the situation, and only then move to formal steps.” (Participant 4)

Informality was not perceived as a deviation from governance, but as an essential mechanism that enabled formal systems to function effectively within local social contexts.

Another participant stated:

“If you rely only on documents and procedures, you will face many problems. Informal communication helps reduce tension and build understanding.” (Participant 6)

These experiences indicate that governance at the grassroots level operates through a hybrid logic, where formal authority and informal practices coexist and mutually reinforce one another.

Negotiating Legitimacy Through Trust and Recognition

Participants emphasized that their sense of power and authority depended heavily on social legitimacy, particularly trust from the community. Legitimacy was experienced not as something automatically granted by the state, but as something earned through consistent interaction and responsiveness.

One participant reflected:

“People listen to us not because of our position, but because they believe we are on their side.” (Participant 1)

Trust was described as fragile and easily damaged, especially when decisions were perceived as unfair or insensitive to local conditions.

Another participant added:

“Once trust is broken, even the strongest authority becomes weak.” (Participant 3)

These narratives converge on a central insight: power becomes effective only when recognized as legitimate by the community. Trust functions as the underlying currency of authority, while coercion is viewed as fragile and ultimately unsustainable. This finding integrates the previous themes by showing that negotiation, ethical judgment, and informal engagement all serve to sustain legitimacy.

These narratives reveal that power, as experienced by local officials, is deeply intertwined with recognition and moral credibility rather than coercion.

DISCUSSION

Summary of Key Findings

This study demonstrates that local officials experience power not as a fixed institutional resource, but as a negotiated, moral, and relational process embedded in everyday governance. These findings directly address the central question posed in the Introduction by revealing how power is lived, interpreted, and continuously reworked at the intersection of state demands and citizens' expectations. More importantly, the findings reposition power within governance theory as an emergent social practice rather than a stable institutional attribute, thereby challenging dominant structuralist accounts that conceptualize authority primarily in legal-administrative terms.

Contribution of the Findings to the Research Question

The findings provide a substantive answer to the research question concerning how local officials experience and make sense of power negotiation in daily governance practices. Rather than framing power as a unidirectional exercise of authority, the study shows that power is experienced as contingent on social acceptance, trust, and situational judgment. Local officials do not merely implement rules; they actively interpret, adjust, and negotiate them in response to concrete social realities (Nipa et al., 2025). This experiential orientation highlights governance as a dynamic process shaped by interaction, ethical reflection, and emotional engagement, rather than as a purely administrative function.

Theoretically, this finding contributes to governance scholarship by complicating rational-institutional models that treat discretion as a bounded managerial tool. Instead, discretion emerges here as a socially embedded and morally charged practice, suggesting that power is co-produced

through interaction rather than possessed by virtue of office alone. This reframing advances governance theory by foregrounding relational legitimacy as a constitutive dimension of authority.

By foregrounding lived experience, the study contributes a perspective that has been largely absent from mainstream governance research. The findings reveal that moral dilemmas particularly tensions between bureaucratic rules and human considerations are not peripheral challenges but constitutive elements of governance practice. Informal strategies, often marginalized in formal analyses, emerge as central mechanisms through which officials sustain legitimacy and manage conflict (Zheng et al., 2025). In this way, the study advances understanding of power as something that is continuously produced and maintained through everyday encounters, offering a more nuanced account of governance at the grassroots level.

Relationship to Previous Literature and Theory

The findings align with and extend existing scholarship on street-level bureaucracy, particularly studies emphasizing discretion and moral reasoning among frontline officials. While prior research has established that officials exercise discretion in implementing policy, this study deepens that insight by illuminating how discretion is experienced as a moral and relational burden rather than a purely technical choice (Parthasarathy et al., 2025). The phenomenological focus reveals the internal tensions and meaning-making processes that accompany discretionary action, dimensions that are often implicit but underdeveloped in earlier work.

The results also resonate with Zacka's (2017) analysis of ethical judgment in bureaucratic life, particularly the idea that governance involves moral commitments that cannot be reduced to rule-following (Flores-Fernandez et al., 2025). However, this study complements such theoretical accounts by grounding them in lived experience, showing how ethical reasoning unfolds in concrete interactions with citizens. In contrast to institutional and governance frameworks that emphasize structure and accountability, the findings suggest that legitimacy and effectiveness are experienced primarily through trust and recognition (Gurney et al., 2021). This contrasts with dominant governance paradigms rooted in New Public Management and principal-agent theory, which prioritize performance metrics and hierarchical control. By demonstrating that officials interpret authority through relational validation rather than formal compliance alone, the study challenges instrumental views of governance and calls for a more sociologically grounded theory of power. By situating power within everyday social relations, this study contributes to a growing body of work that rethinks governance not only as a system of rules, but as a lived social practice shaped by meaning, responsibility, and relational engagement.

Implications of the Findings

The findings of this study carry important implications for both scholarly understanding and practical engagement with local governance. From a scientific perspective, the study reinforces the need to conceptualize power not solely as an institutional or legal construct, but as a lived and relational experience shaped by moral judgment, trust, and everyday interaction (Lusasi et al., 2025). This perspective contributes to political sociology by demonstrating that governance practices are sustained through subjective meaning-making processes that influence how authority is enacted and perceived. More broadly, the study invites a theoretical recalibration within governance research: rather than treating relational dynamics as secondary variables influencing policy implementation, they should be understood as foundational mechanisms through which authority is constituted and stabilized. This reconceptualization has implications for debates on democratic legitimacy, suggesting that legitimacy emerges as an affective and relational achievement rather than merely an institutional status.

From a practical standpoint, the findings suggest that policies and administrative frameworks may benefit from acknowledging the experiential realities of local officials (Mukhlis, 2025b; Mukhlis, Suradi, et al., 2023). Training and capacity-building initiatives that emphasize ethical reflection, relational skills, and contextual sensitivity may enhance governance effectiveness and legitimacy (Cheng & Tong, 2025). By foregrounding trust, informal negotiation, and moral responsibility as central components of everyday governance, the study highlights the importance of supporting

officials not only through procedural guidelines but also through professional cultures that value judgment and empathy (Rusydi, 2025). These insights are relevant beyond the specific research context, as similar dynamics are likely to emerge in other settings where frontline actors mediate between state authority and community needs.

Limitations of the Study

Several limitations should be considered when interpreting the findings. First, the phenomenological design prioritizes depth over breadth, focusing on a small number of participants to explore lived experience in detail. While this approach is well suited to capturing meaning, it limits the generalizability of the findings to other institutional or cultural contexts. Second, the study is situated within a specific local governance setting, and experiences of power may differ in regions with distinct administrative structures or socio-political conditions (Eales et al., 2021). Finally, the reliance on self-reported narratives may be influenced by participants' reflective capacity or willingness to articulate sensitive experiences, although strategies such as member checking were employed to enhance credibility.

Prospective Directions for Future Research

The findings open several avenues for future research within political sociology and governance studies. Subsequent studies may extend this phenomenological approach to comparative contexts, examining how lived experiences of power differ across institutional settings or cultural environments. Future research could also integrate phenomenological insights with complementary qualitative approaches to explore how experiential meanings interact with organizational structures and policy outcomes (Beeri, 2025).

Comparative studies examining similar frontline governance contexts in different political regimes would be particularly valuable in testing the theoretical proposition advanced here—that relational legitimacy constitutes a core dimension of authority. Such research could clarify whether the experiential constitution of power identified in this study represents a context-specific phenomenon or a broader pattern within contemporary governance.

By building on the experiential foundation established in this study, further inquiry can deepen understanding of governance as a human practice and contribute to more context-sensitive theories of power and authority.

CONCLUSION

This study examined the lived experiences of local officials in negotiating power within everyday governance practices, addressing a persistent gap in political sociology regarding the subjective dimensions of authority. The findings demonstrate that local officials sustain governance effectiveness by continuously negotiating authority through moral judgment, trust-building practices, and direct engagement with citizens, rather than relying solely on formal institutional mandates. Power emerges as a relational and dialogical process embedded in everyday interactions, where legitimacy is constructed through ethical reflection and responsiveness to community expectations. By foregrounding lived experience, the study moves beyond dominant structural and policy-centered approaches and provides a deeper understanding of governance as a human practice. These insights contribute to existing scholarship by clarifying how informal strategies and ethical reflection sustain legitimacy and effectiveness in local governance. The study also demonstrates the value of interpretative phenomenology for capturing meanings that remain inaccessible through conventional analytical methods. Future research may extend this approach to comparative or cross-cultural contexts to further enrich theoretical and empirical understandings of power and governance.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The authors declare that there is no conflict of interest regarding the publication of this article. The funding body had no role in the design of the study, data collection, analysis, interpretation of the findings, or the decision to submit the manuscript for publication.

REFERENCES

- Andrade-Suárez, M., & Caamaño-Franco, I. (2020). The relationship between industrial heritage, wine tourism, and sustainability: A case of local community perspective. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 12(18). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.3390/SU12187453>
- Beeri, I. (2025). Who suffers the most? Wild boars, perceived harm, and local politics: Governance challenges in urban human-wildlife conflicts. *Cities*, 165. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cities.2025.106083>
- Brännlund, A., & Rapeli, L. (2025). Who's afraid of cryptoization? Evidence from a survey experiment in Finland. *Review of International Political Economy*, 32(2), 329–352. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09692290.2024.2424863>
- Carreiras, H., & Castro, C. (2012). *Qualitative methods in military studies: Research experiences and challenges* (p. 194). Taylor and Francis. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203099223>
- Chen, S., & Jiang, X. (2025). Performing balanced aspirations through identity capital: A case study of Chinese Ivy League influencers on RedNote. *Journal of Consumer Culture*, 25(3), 219–237. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1177/14695405251330768>
- Cheng, E. W., & Tong, K.-L. (2025). Variegated city-region governance: Centralised design, localised implementation and asymmetric integration in China's Greater Bay Area. *Territory, Politics, Governance*, 13(5), 716–736. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1080/21622671.2025.2492189>
- Couto, G., Pimentel, P., Batista, M. D. G., Sousa, Á., Carvalho, C., & Castanho, R. A. (2021). The potential of rural tourism development in the azores islands from the perspective of public administration and decision-makers. *WSEAS Transactions on Environment and Development*, 17, 713–721. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.37394/232015.2021.17.68>
- Daly, K. J. (2007). *Qualitative methods for family studies & human development* (p. 293). SAGE Publications Inc. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.4135/9781452224800>
- Datta-Roy, A., Sheth, C., & Leisz, S. J. (2025). The Future of Swidden in the Asian Highlands: Insights from a Village in Upper Siang, Arunachal Pradesh, India. *Human Ecology*, 53(2), 259–277. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10745-025-00600-1>
- Eales, J., Bethel, A., Fullam, J., Olmesdahl, S., Wulandari, P., & Garside, R. (2021). What is the evidence documenting the effects of marine or coastal nature conservation or natural resource management activities on human well-being in South East Asia? A systematic map. *Environment International*, 151. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envint.2021.106397>
- Erdmenger, E. C. (2023). The end of participatory destination governance as we thought to know it. *Tourism Geographies*, 25(4), 1104–1126. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14616688.2022.2086904>
- Fife, W. (2020). *Counting as a Qualitative Method: Grappling with the Reliability Issue in Ethnographic Research* (p. 140). Springer International Publishing. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-34803-8>
- Flores-Fernandez, V., van den Broeck, P., Hermans, E., & Parra, C. (2025). Transformations and eco-territorial governance innovations: The case of the Chaparri Nature Reserve, Peru. *Geoforum*, 159. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.geoforum.2024.104178>
- Gurney, G. G., Mangubhai, S., Fox, M., Kiatkoski Kim, M., & Agrawal, A. (2021). Equity in environmental governance: Perceived fairness of distributional justice principles in marine co-management. *Environmental Science and Policy*, 124, 23–32. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsci.2021.05.022>

- Harida, E. S. (2025). Students' Meaning-Making in Multicultural Interactions: A Phenomenological Study in International English Classrooms. *Journal of Educational Innovation and Research*, 1(5), 180–187. <https://journals.ai-mrc.com/jeir/article/view/327>
- Hillman, W., & Radel, K. (2018). *Qualitative methods in tourism research: Theory and practice* (p. 294). Channel View Publications. Scopus. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85050434848&partnerID=40&md5=7ea1e3f0b2027993b53f6a795804ee51>
- Iosifides, T. (2016). *Qualitative Methods in Migration Studies: A Critical Realist Perspective* (p. 266). Taylor and Francis. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315603124>
- Kawamura, Y. (2020). *DOING RESEARCH IN FASHION AND DRESS: An Introduction to Qualitative Methods, 2nd edition* (p. 166). Bloomsbury Publishing Plc. Scopus. <https://www.scopus.com/inward/record.uri?eid=2-s2.0-85188589040&partnerID=40&md5=b3db406659cd1ea5b20e05664bec39a3>
- Longhofer, J., Floersch, J., & Hoy, J. (2012). *Qualitative Methods for Practice Research* (p. 224). Oxford University Press. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1093/acprof:oso/9780195398472.001.0001>
- Lusasi, J. E., Charles, J. S., & Dungumaro, E. W. (2025). Understanding land governance and knowledge gaps in the Southern Highlands of Tanzania. *GeoJournal*, 90(5). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10708-025-11476-5>
- Lutz, W., & Knox, S. (2014). *Quantitative and qualitative methods in psychotherapy research* (p. 448). Taylor and Francis. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9780203386071>
- Macdonald, K., Hartoto, A. S., Unger, C., Cisneros, P., Delgado Pugley, D. D., Herreras Salazar, D., Winanti, P. S., & Kurniawan, N. I. (2024). The politics of accountability in global sustainable commodity governance: Dilemmas of institutional competition and convergence. *Global Policy*, 15(5), 838–854. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1111/1758-5899.13426>
- Magnusson, J., Lindroth, T., Lindström, N. B., & Torell, J. (2025). The vicious circle of ambiguity: How governance deters digital transformation in municipal conglomerates. *Public Money and Management*, 45(7), 828–836. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2025.2466489>
- Makinara, I. K., Rani, F. A., Idami, Z., & Rinaldi, Y. (2025). Negotiating Sharia and Power: Political Dynamics behind the Drafting of the Qanun on Ahwal Al-Syakhsiyyah in Aceh. *Samarah*, 9(2), 1154–1172. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.22373/k97hy420>
- Masum, M. A., & Parker, L. (2024). The interface between traditional organisational practices and a World Bank-led performance management reform. *Meditari Accountancy Research*, 32(5), 1931–1976. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MEDAR-06-2023-2041>
- Mattes, A., Haselbacher, M., Limacher, K., & Novak, C. (2024). Religion and politics of belonging in digital times: Youth religiosity in focus. *Frontiers in Political Science*, 6. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpos.2024.1476762>
- McDermott, R., Sagala, S., Susetyo, N. A., Insan, A., Harahap, W. D. P., Indrarini, A., & Azhari, D. (2025). The role of digital participation platforms in risk-informed development: A case study of Surabaya, Indonesia. *Progress in Disaster Science*, 26. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pdisas.2025.100430>
- McNabb, D. E. (2015). *Research methods for political science: Quantitative and qualitative methods: Second edition* (p. 426). Taylor and Francis. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315701141>
- Miao, L., & Yang, L. (2024). Translingual identity across transnational education spaces: Study on a group of Chinese students in joint education programme. *Journal of Multilingual and Multicultural Development*, 45(7), 2651–2665. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01434632.2022.2061497>
- Migdal, A. B. (2018). *Qualitative Methods in Quantum Theory* (p. 460). CRC Press. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9780429497940>

- Mukhlis, L. (2025a). A Phenomenological Study of Personal Spiritual Experiences in Navigating Religious Pluralism within Interfaith Communities. *Irfana: Journal of Religious Studies*, 1(6), 212–220.
- Mukhlis, L. (2025b). Spiritual Grounds for Economic Growth: A Qualitative Exploration of Rural Indonesian Women's Transformative Journeys Through Mosque-Led Empowerment Programs. *Servina: Jurnal Pengabdian Kepada Masyarakat*, 1(8), 289–298.
- Mukhlis, L., & Abdullah, M. N. (2025). *Hukum Keluarga Islam di Indonesia* (1st ed.). Mukhlisina Revolution Center.
- Mukhlis, L., Arifin, T., Ridwan, A. H., & Zulbaidah. (2024). Integrating Artificial Intelligence and Maqāṣid al-Syarī'ah: Revolutionizing Indonesia's Sharia Online Trading System. *Computer Fraud and Security*, 2024(11), 301–309. <https://doi.org/10.52710/cfs.238>
- Mukhlis, L., Arifin, T., Ridwan, A. H., & Zulbaidah. (2025). Reorientation of Sharia Stock Regulations: Integrating Taṣarrufāt al-Rasūl and Maqāṣid al-Sharī'ah for Justice and Sustainability. *Journal of Information Systems Engineering and Management*, 10(10s), 58–66. <https://doi.org/10.52783/jisem.v10i10s.1341>
- Mukhlis, L., Arifin, T., Ridwan, A. H., Zulbaidah, Rosadi, A., & Solehudin, E. (2025). Reformulation of Islamic Stock Law: The Application of Taṣarrufāt al-Rasūl and Maqāṣid al-Syarī'ah to Develop a Dynamic and Sustainable Islamic Capital Market in Indonesia. *Journal of Posthumanism*, 5(3), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.63332/joph.v5i3.913>
- Mukhlis, L., Janwari, Y., & Syafe'i, R. (2023). INDONESIA STOCK EXCHANGE: THEORETICAL AND PHILOSOPHICAL ANALYSIS OF MUDHARABAH AND MUSYARAKAH CONTRACTS. *Yurisprudencia: Jurnal Hukum Ekonomi*, 9(2), 243–264. <https://doi.org/10.24952/yurisprudencia.v9i2.8466>
- Mukhlis, L., Maryam, S., & Sormin, S. A. (2023). Model Pembelajaran Living History Berbasis PjBL Untuk Meningkatkan Keterampilan Histografi Mahasiswa. *Jurnal Educatio FKIP UNMA*, 9(4), 1800–1809. <https://doi.org/10.31949/educatio.v9i4.5595>
- Mukhlis, L., & Saidah, Y. (2025). Dynamics of Nature-Based learning in Developing Children's Motoric Skills: Teacher and Parent Perspectives. *HUMANISMA: Journal of Gender Studies*, 9(1), 64–79. <http://dx.doi.org/10.30983/humanisme.v4i2.9366>
- Mukhlis, L., Suradi, Janwari, Y., & Syafe'i, R. (2023). Sosialisasi Saham Syariah sebagai Instrumen Pengembangan Ekonomi Masyarakat di Badan Kontak Majelis Taklim (BKMT) Kabupaten Mandailing Natal. *Jurnal Pengabdian Multidisiplin*, 3(2), 2–9. <https://doi.org/10.51214/japamul.v3i2.604>
- Nasreldin, M., Riehl, S., & Obłuski, A. (2025). The Exploitation of Cultivated and Wild Plants During the Kingdom of Dongola (14th–18th centuries CE): Archaeobotanical Evidence from Old Dongola, Northern Sudan. *Interdisciplinaria Archaeologica*, 16(2). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.24916/iansa.2025.2.2>
- Nipa, F., Lino, A. F., & Arun, T. (2025). Third-Sector Organizations as Intermediaries in Climate Action: Engaging Vulnerable Communities in Co-Production in Bangladesh. *Governance*, 38(4). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1111/gove.70058>
- Parthasarathy, D., Srivastava, S., Mehta, L., Bose, S., & Movik, S. (2025). Transformation in the context of uncertainty and compounding effects: Insights from marginal environments in India and Bangladesh. *Global Environmental Change*, 93. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2025.103025>
- Ratmono, D., Cholbyah, A., Cahyonowati, N., & Darsono, D. (2021). The problem of corruption in government organizations: Empirical evidence from Indonesia. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 19(4), 29–39. Scopus. [https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.19\(4\).2021.03](https://doi.org/10.21511/ppm.19(4).2021.03)

- Rusydi, M. (2025). Visionary Leadership in Islamic Boarding Schools: Implications for Institutional Management within the Barakka Framework. *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 24(8), 1041–1057. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.24.8.46>
- Sahara, S., & Suriyani, M. (2024). The Implications of Regulating Zakat to Reduce Income Tax and Make it A Source of Local Revenue in Aceh. *Samarah*, 8(3), 1763–1781. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.22373/sjhk.v8i3.24159>
- Shao, X., & Li, X. (2025). The grand bargain on local government debt: Evidence from China's intergovernmental relations. *Public Money and Management*, 45(4), 338–348. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09540962.2024.2334066>
- Wallace, R., & Smith, K. (2024). Who Cares? Women entrepreneurs and the transition to the Canada-wide Early Learning and Child Care Agreement in Nova Scotia. *Women's Studies International Forum*, 107. Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.wsif.2024.102992>
- Yasih, D. (2025). Precarious Proletarians: Women Workers in the Javanese Heartland. *Journal of Agrarian Change*, 25(4). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.1111/joac.70028>
- Zheng, J., Liu, Y., Li, X., Xie, M., & Ge, W. (2025). Toward a Disciplinary Knowledge-Led Approach for Sustainable Heritage-Based Art Districts in Shanghai. *Sustainability (Switzerland)*, 17(18). Scopus. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su17188215>