



SIGn Journal of Social Science

E-ISSN: 2745-374X

jurnal.penerbitsign.com/index.php/sjss/article/view/v5n2-02

Vol. 5 Issue 2: December 2024 – May 2025

Published Online: May 12, 2025

Article Title

The Concept of Community Empowerment versus Community Advancement: A Comparative Study in the Context of Social Development in Indonesia

Author(s)

Abd. Rasyid*

Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia // rasyidmuiz4@gmail.com

*Corresponding Author

Dwia Aries Tina Pulubuhu

Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia // dwiatn@unhas.ac.id

Rahmat Muhammad

Universitas Hasanuddin, Indonesia // rahmatmuhammad131@gmail.com

How to cite:

Rasyid, A., Pulubuhu, D. A. T., & Muhammad, R. (2025). The Concept of Community Empowerment versus Community Advancement: A Comparative Study in the Context of Social Development in Indonesia. *SIGn Journal of Social Science*, 5(2), 97-112. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjss.v5i2.430>



This work is licensed under a [CC BY-4.0 License](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)

ABSTRACT

Community interventions through community empowerment and community advancement are crucial within Indonesia's social development agenda, yet their effectiveness is often constrained by conceptual ambiguity between these two approaches. This research aimed to conduct an in-depth comparative study of community empowerment versus community advancement within the Indonesian context, encompassing a comparative analysis of concepts and theoretical foundations, a review of program implementation examples, and identifying their application challenges and opportunities. Employing a qualitative approach with a literature study method and secondary document analysis, this study thematically and comparatively analyzed various textual data sources. The analysis revealed fundamental differences between the two concepts: community empowerment inherently focuses on enhancing agency and shifting power relations, while community advancement is more oriented towards improving socio-economic conditions and infrastructure, although conceptual intersections and significant terminological conflation were also identified. In terms of implementation, programs reflecting community empowerment tend to emphasize substantive participation and strengthening internal capacities, whereas advancement-oriented programs focus more on achieving physical outputs; however, hybrid practices and the strong influence of contextual variations are prominent in the field. Both approaches face systemic challenges (e.g., institutional capacity, sustainability) and specific challenges (e.g., elite capture in empowerment, maintenance issues in advancement), yet opportunities for synergy also exist through decentralization frameworks and technology adoption. It is concluded that a clear understanding of the essential differences, similarities, and potential synergies between community empowerment and community advancement forms a fundamental basis for designing and implementing more effective, contextual, adaptive, and transformative social development interventions in Indonesia.

Keywords: *Community Advancement; Community Empowerment; Comparative Study; Social Development.*

INTRODUCTION

The dynamics of social development in Indonesia consistently place improving community-level quality of life as a primary priority agenda (Utami et al., 2023). Various policy initiatives and programs continue to be introduced to accelerate the achievement of more equitable social, economic, and political welfare amidst complex challenges such as structural poverty (Sabarisman, 2017), unequal access to resources (Arsyad et al., 2020), and socio-ecological vulnerabilities (Hababil et al., 2024). The success of these endeavors significantly depends on selecting and implementing effective, contextually relevant, and sustainable grassroots-level intervention strategies. Within this context, a profound understanding of diverse approaches to mobilize and strengthen community capacities becomes crucial for academics, development practitioners, and policymakers alike.

In Indonesia's discourse and practice of social development, two central concepts that frequently emerge and serve as primary references are community empowerment and community advancement. Although both are often used interchangeably or considered synonymous, conceptually, they possess fundamentally different emphases and orientations. Community empowerment, as frequently highlighted by thinkers such as Chambers (1997) or Suharto (2005), tends to focus on the process

of enhancing capacities, fostering independence, and strengthening the bargaining position (power) of individuals and groups to control their own lives and resources. Conversely, community advancement is often interpreted more broadly, encompassing various planned interventions for the collective improvement of socio-economic conditions and community infrastructure, which do not always explicitly emphasize a shift in power relations as is characteristic of pure empowerment concepts.

A fundamental issue arises when the conceptual boundary between community empowerment and advancement becomes blurred at discursive and field implementation levels. This lack of clarity, or even conflation, in using these terms risks leading to unfocused program designs, less targeted intervention strategies, and difficulties in conducting accurate impact evaluations of the changes anticipated within communities. For instance, a program labeled “empowerment” that, in practice, focuses more on providing physical aid without efforts to enhance critical capacities or foster community organization may raise questions regarding the congruence between the espoused concept and its operational reality (Purnomo et al., 2022). This situation underscores the urgency for a lucid comparative analysis of these two concepts, particularly within Indonesia’s diverse contexts of social development.

The understanding and comparison of these two approaches can be enriched through various relevant theoretical lenses within social and development studies. For example, through the idea of the “ladder of participation” popularized by Arnstein (1969), the participation perspective becomes pertinent for analyzing the extent to which community involvement is substantive in both approaches—mere mobilization or complete control. Similarly, as developed by Putnam (2000), social capital theory offers a framework for understanding how social networks, trust, and norms can facilitate or impede empowerment or advancement processes. Furthermore, critical dimensions such as liberation from oppressive structures through conscientization, as articulated by Freire (1970), and the emphasis on enhancing capabilities, control over decisions, and individual self-confidence, as reviewed by Chambers (1997), Korten (1990), and Triatmanto et al. (2024), provide other vital aspects that can be employed to dissect and compare the essence and implications of applying the concepts of community empowerment versus community advancement.

Proceeding from ascertaining the urgency for conceptual clarification and practical analysis, this research aims to conduct a comparative study between community empowerment and community advancement within Indonesia’s social development context. More specifically, this research intends to (1) Analyze and compare the conceptual definitions and principal theoretical foundations of the community empowerment and community advancement approaches; (2) Identify and compare the characteristics and examples of program implementations that tend to reflect either the community empowerment or community advancement approach across various local contexts in Indonesia; and (3) Identify and analyze the similarities

and differences in challenges and opportunities encountered in the application of both approaches in Indonesia. The achievement of these objectives will be based on an in-depth analysis of relevant secondary data, encompassing academic literature, program reports, policy documents, and other credible sources that record the discourse or practice of both approaches in Indonesia.

Through this systematic comparative analysis, this study is expected to make several significant contributions. Theoretically, this research endeavors to clarify the conceptual boundaries between community empowerment and community advancement and their interrelational dynamics within the Indonesian context, thereby enriching the scholarly domains of the sociology of community empowerment and social development studies. Practically, the findings from this research are anticipated to offer valuable insights for program designers, field facilitators, donor agencies, and the government in formulating community intervention strategies that are more targeted, effective, and capable of fostering transformative and sustainable social change aligned with the spirit of the chosen approach.

METHOD

This research employed a qualitative approach with a comparative and descriptive-analytical literature study design (Neuman, 2003). This approach was selected for its suitability in conducting an in-depth examination of the concepts, meanings, and application contexts of community empowerment and community advancement as represented in various textual sources. All analyses within this study are based entirely on using secondary data sources relevant to the comparative focus on these two concepts within Indonesia's social development framework. Consequently, this research did not involve primary data collection in the field but instead concentrated on synthesizing and critically analyzing pre-existing information.

The relevant secondary data collection process was executed through a systematic search strategy across several academic databases and prominent scholarly publication repositories, including Google Scholar, Sinta, Garuda, and Scopus. The search process was focused on using a carefully determined set of primary keywords to capture a representative corpus of data, such as 'community empowerment,' 'community advancement,' 'social development,' and 'Indonesian government programs' linked to the national context. The textual data gathered from selected sources were then analyzed in-depth and interpretatively using thematic and qualitative content analysis techniques. These two qualitative analysis techniques were systematically utilized to identify, classify, and understand patterns of meaning, extract recurring key themes, and perform interpretations of the substantial comparisons between the concepts of community empowerment and community advancement as presented in the textual data. Through this method's careful and structured application, the presented analysis is anticipated to comprehensively address the previously established research objectives.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Community Empowerment versus Community Advancement: A Conceptual Study

The discourse surrounding community-level interventions within the social development framework in Indonesia is inextricably linked to the use of two central terminologies: community empowerment and community advancement. These terms frequently color policy narratives, program designs, and evaluation reports; however, their often overlapping or even equated usage poses a distinct challenge in understanding the proper orientation, strategies, and benchmarks for success being pursued. This lack of clear conceptual boundaries can potentially obscure the direction of interventions and complicate the objective assessment of anticipated social changes. Therefore, an in-depth analytical dissection of each approach's conceptual essence and theoretical foundations becomes a fundamental step toward building a more precise and critical understanding before analyzing their practical implementation in the field. This sub-section will specifically delineate and compare the conceptual roots and theoretical dimensions that inherently differentiate and connect community empowerment and advancement based on a synthesis of literature from key experts and thinkers in this field.

Community empowerment refers to a transformative process fundamentally aimed at altering power relations and enhancing the agency of marginalized individuals and collectives. Its primary focus lies in strengthening the internal capacities of the community—encompassing knowledge, skills, and self-confidence—to enable them to identify problems, access and manage resources, and independently make strategic decisions concerning their livelihoods, as emphasized by thinkers such as [Chambers \(1997\)](#) and [Triatmanto et al. \(2024\)](#). More than mere technical capacity building, empowerment is often intertwined with the dimension of liberation (emancipation) from oppressive socio-political structures through a process of critical conscientization, an idea firmly rooted in the thought of [Freire \(1970\)](#). Consequently, participation within the empowerment framework ideally transcends merely formalistic involvement; it demands a shift in control towards partnership or even full command by the community over the development process itself, a spectrum depicted in [Arnstein \(1969\)](#) ladder of participation. This approach, as reviewed by [Suharto \(2005\)](#), necessitates strengthening local social institutions and increased accessibility, positioning the community as active subjects determining their own trajectory of change rather than mere objects of intervention.

In contrast to the emphasis on transforming power relations and strengthening internal agency inherent in empowerment, community advancement is often understood within a broader scope, oriented towards the holistic improvement of community quality of life through more planned interventions,

which do not intrinsically focus on power shifts. Although [Trisusilo and Hermawan \(2025\)](#) emphasize that ideal community advancement also aims to create self-reliant positive change and positions the community as the primary driver, much of the literature and practice associate it with efforts to improve external conditions and socio-economic infrastructure. It can include developing physical facilities, enhanced access to basic services (health, education), or strengthening social structures and networks to support sustainability ([Kristanto & Putri, 2021](#)). Within this framework, consistent with [Korten \(1990\)](#) views on the importance of local capacity, the enhancement of individual or group capacities is often viewed as one component or instrument for achieving broader development goals but not always as an ultimate aim that emphasizes structural liberation, as is the case in the critical empowerment paradigm.

A comparative analysis of these two concepts reveals fundamental differences across several key dimensions. *Firstly*, it lies in the primary focus of intervention: community empowerment explicitly targets shifts in power and increased control by marginalized groups, whereas community advancement is often oriented towards improving general welfare or living conditions. *Secondly*, the idealized processes tend to differ: community empowerment emphasizes bottom-up processes, substantive participation, and self-organization, while community advancement can accommodate more top-down or externally planned approaches, although its participative forms are also evolving. *Thirdly*, the ultimate goals are often distinguished: community empowerment aims for social transformation and political independence, while community advancement targets improvements in socio-economic conditions within structures that may not undergo radical change. *Fourthly*, the ideal roles of external actors differ: they are facilitators or catalysts in community empowerment compared to planners or providers of services/resources in many community advancement models.

Nevertheless, it is essential to acknowledge that the distinction between community empowerment and advancement is not absolutely black-and-white or rigidly defined. In both discursive and practical realities, significant grey areas and potential overlaps exist between the two. Many modern community advancement programs adopt participation and capacity-building principles central to community empowerment. Conversely, successful empowerment efforts often require resource support and changes in external conditions, which are a focus of community advancement. Both can also share elements such as strengthening social capital as an essential mechanism for achieving community goals ([Putnam, 2000](#)). Therefore, the conflation in using these terms in the field also reflects attempts to integrate or combine the best elements from both approaches. However, this necessitates greater conceptual clarity in their planning.

The synthesis of this conceptual analysis affirms that community empowerment and advancement, despite often being used in the same contexts and sharing some common elements, theoretically stem from significantly different basic assumptions, intervention focuses, and objective horizons. Empowerment is rooted in a critical paradigm emphasizing agency and power transformation, whereas advancement is often rooted in a functionalist paradigm or planned interventions for improving conditions. Understanding these fundamental differences and the potential intersections between these two concepts forms an essential foundation before further examining how these approaches are implemented and what challenges and opportunities accompany them within Indonesia's complex and diverse landscape of social development.

B. Implementation of Community Empowerment and Community Advancement Programs in Indonesia

As previously delineated, understanding the conceptual differences between community empowerment and community advancement is crucial yet insufficient without examining their manifestations in the practical implementation of programs in Indonesia. Analysis of various secondary documentation, such as program reports, evaluation results, and prior case studies, reveals patterns and implementation characteristics that tend to differ between programs oriented towards empowerment compared to those focused on advancement. This sub-section will present the findings of a comparative review concerning the implementation landscape of these two types of approaches across diverse Indonesian local contexts, highlighting distinctive execution features, emergent variations, and the presence of hybrid practices in the field. This examination is essential for understanding how theoretical concepts are translated—or sometimes distorted—within the reality of social development program execution.

Implementing programs that explicitly espouse or substantively execute community empowerment agendas in Indonesia is often characterized by strongly emphasizing participatory processes and strengthening internal community capacities (Rahmadani et al., 2024). Various historical and contemporary programs, such as the National Program for Community Empowerment (PNPM) Mandiri during its tenure or the utilization of the Village Fund for non-physical activities, frequently prioritized bottom-up planning mechanisms through village deliberation forums as arenas for articulating citizens' needs and aspirations (Hidayat et al., 2024). The formation or strengthening of community groups—farmer groups, joint business groups, women's groups, or Village-Owned Enterprises—became a central strategy for building solidarity, collective capacity, and socio-economic bargaining power. The primary focus of activities in these empowerment-oriented programs generally revolved around enhancing human resource capacities through a series of technical skills training (agriculture,

crafts), managerial training (business management, finance), literacy programs (digital, legal), and intensive mentoring to facilitate community learning and self-organization processes. Components for raising critical consciousness or strengthening advocacy capacities were also sometimes present, although their implementation often varied depending on program design and the capacity of field facilitators.

On the other hand, programs typically categorized within the framework of community advancement or physical development exhibit significantly different implementation characteristics. The primary focus is frequently on achieving physical output targets or improving infrastructure and basic services, such as the construction of village roads, bridges, irrigation systems, sanitation, and clean water facilities, or the rehabilitation of school buildings and health centers, many of which were funded through Village Fund allocations for infrastructure or programs from technical ministries like the Ministry of Public Works and Housing (Ulandari et al., 2024). Planning in these types of programs, although potentially involving public consultation, was often more centralized (top-down) or technocratic, determined by technical standards and regional or national development priorities set by relevant government agencies, such as the National Development Planning Agency (Bappenas) in the context of broader regional planning or projects like the National Urban Development Project (Halimah & Karyana, 2017). Dominant activities included construction, procurement of goods/services, or direct service provision to the community, with success metrics more often measured by the quantity and quality of physical outputs produced or improved access to services rather than changes in capacity or power relations at the community level.

A comparative analysis of these two implementation styles reveals a divergence consistent with their conceptual differences. Empowerment-oriented programs emphasize process (participation, learning, organization) and the strengthening of the subject (capacity, agency, control). In contrast, advancement-oriented programs emphasize output (infrastructure, services) and the improvement of the object (environmental conditions, accessibility). The locus of planning and decision-making tends to be more decentralized and community-based in the ideal empowerment model, contrasting with the advancement model, which is often more centralized or initiated by external actors. Consequently, the role of external actors (government, NGOs, facilitators) in ideal empowerment is that of a facilitator and catalyst for internal community processes, whereas, in advancement, their role is more often that of a planner, funder, implementer, or service provider. This distinction also manifests in the success indicators used; empowerment would look at changes in capacity, independence, and active participation, while advancement focuses more on the completion of physical targets or improvements in macro-welfare indicators.

Nevertheless, the reality of implementation in the field often presents a more complex picture than a simple dichotomy between empowerment and advancement. Analysis of various programs, such as utilizing the Village Fund or the City without Slums (KOTAKU) program, indicates the existence of hybrid practices where physical development elements are integrated with efforts to strengthen capacity or involve the community. For example, the flexibility in using the Village Fund allows village governments to allocate funds for infrastructure and training or Village-Owned Enterprises (Resdiana & Puspaningrum, 2020), creating mixed models whose application heavily depends on the vision of village leadership and local dynamics. Furthermore, the effectiveness and nature of program implementation, whether labeled as empowerment or advancement, have proven to be highly influenced by the local context, including socio-cultural conditions, initial levels of social capital, quality of local leadership, village institutional capacity, and the history of previous interventions. It underscores that the success or failure of an approach is not solely determined by its program design but also by its interaction with the unique contextual realities in each region.

Overall, the review of program implementation in Indonesia based on secondary data indicates discernible pattern tendencies between approaches focused on empowerment and those oriented towards advancement, particularly regarding activity focus, planning mechanisms, and actor roles. Nonetheless, field practices are also characterized by hybrid models and significant variations in implementation due to the influence of local contexts. An understanding of this diverse implementation landscape is crucial for appreciating the complexity of social development efforts in Indonesia. It provides a basis for analyzing the challenges and opportunities of applying both approaches.

C. Challenges, Opportunities, and Comparative Implications in Social Development in Indonesia: A Critical Reflection

The analysis of the implementation landscape of community empowerment and community advancement programs in Indonesia logically leads to an examination of the accompanying practical consequences, particularly in the form of challenges faced and opportunities that can be optimized. The inherent differences in focus, process, and objectives between the two approaches, as previously delineated, are found to correlate with distinct patterns of constraints and potentials, although cross-cutting issues also affect both. A profound understanding of this arena of challenges and opportunities is crucial for evaluating the effectiveness of past interventions and formulating more adaptive, resilient, and transformative social development strategies for the future. This sub-section critically reflects on the findings related to these challenges and opportunities and discusses the implications of the comparison between community empowerment and community advancement for the direction of social development in Indonesia.

A synthesis of various reports and secondary studies indicates the existence of several fundamental challenges that frequently characterize the implementation of community programs in Indonesia, whether oriented towards empowerment or advancement. Classic problems such as limited institutional capacity at the village government level and among local civil society organizations often become stumbling blocks in program practical and accountable management (Afnan, 2019). Furthermore, the issue of program sustainability after external intervention remains a critical question, signaling difficulties in building structural or financial independence at the community level (Faedlulloh, 2018). Problems of coordination across sectors and between governmental tiers are also consistently reported to hinder program synergy (Puteri & Adi, 2021), while the issue of inclusivity and ensuring that the most vulnerable groups are genuinely reached and benefit (Angriani et al., 2023) continues to be a complex task for nearly all types of interventions. These cross-cutting challenges suggest deeper structural problems related to development governance and socio-economic conditions in Indonesia that must be addressed systemically.

Nevertheless, further analysis reveals challenges that are more prominent or have a different character within each approach. Community empowerment-oriented programs, focusing on power shifts and enhancing agency, often directly confront resistance from established power structures or the phenomenon of elite capture, where local elites dominate participatory processes for their interests (Firdaus, 2018). Ensuring a quality of participation transcending mere mobilization or formalistic consultation, as critiqued in Arnstein (1969) ladder of participation, towards authentic community control proves exceedingly challenging. Efforts to build Freire (1970) critical consciousness also face inherent complexities within diverse local cultural and political contexts. However, dependence on external facilitators and the difficulty of measuring intangible impacts, such as the level of 'empowerment' itself, pose significant methodological and practical constraints.

On the other hand, programs more focused on community advancement or physical development are not exempt from specific challenges. An orientation towards achieving physical output targets can sometimes overlook social dynamics, ecological sustainability, or the long-term real needs of the community, such that the constructed infrastructure may not be optimally utilized or may even create new problems (Pulubuhu et al., 2018). Low community ownership of projects planned in a top-down manner can lead to minimal maintenance of the assets that have been built (Rakhim et al., 2021). Moreover, dependence on external aid or projects can trigger a 'project-waiting' syndrome and weaken local initiatives (Purwanto & Rofiah, 2017). Issues of inequitable benefit distribution from large-scale development projects and potential conflicts arising from land acquisition or environmental impacts also constitute inherent challenges that must be carefully managed within this approach (Irmayani et al., 2023).

Despite being confronted with various challenges, Indonesia's social development landscape also harbors several strategic opportunities that can be leveraged to enhance the effectiveness of both approaches and even foster synergy between them. The era of decentralization and policies such as the Village Law, which channels the Village Fund directly, provide greater fiscal space and authority for villages to design interventions according to local needs, encompassing both infrastructure development (an aspect of advancement) and programs for regional capacity building and economic strengthening (an element of empowerment) (Muis, 2022). Information and communication technology development offers new avenues for improving transparency, accountability, access to information, virtual citizen participation, and opening up market access for community products (Syah, 2022). In addition, if nurtured and optimized, the substantial social capital in many Indonesian communities can serve as a solid foundation for empowerment-based collective action and the management of participatory development projects (Pulubuhu et al., 2019).

The synthesis of the analysis of these challenges and opportunities further strengthens the argument regarding the importance of conceptual clarity between community empowerment and community advancement. Understanding the specific challenges inherent in each approach allows for the formulation of more targeted mitigation strategies. Conversely, identifying existing opportunities, especially those that could bridge the two methods (such as the integrated use of the Village Fund or the application of technology), paves the way for more holistic and contextual intervention designs. Thus, the primary issue is not choosing between empowerment and advancement but how to intelligently combine elements from both approaches proportionally, according to the problem diagnosis, the specific goals to be achieved, and the characteristics of the local context encountered. Overcoming conceptual ambiguity is an essential first step towards moving towards more reflective and effective social development practice.

This comparative study's implications extend to theoretical and practical realms within Indonesia's social development context. Theoretically, this study reasserts that community empowerment and advancement are not monolithic concepts, and their application is highly influenced by interpretation and context. The development of more nuanced analytical frameworks is required to understand the dynamics of interaction between these two approaches. Practically, these findings suggest the need for a shift from rigid programmatic approaches towards intervention strategies that are more adaptive, substantively participatory, and oriented toward continuous learning. Capacity building is needed for the target communities (program recipients) and for government officials, field facilitators, and other social development actors to enable them to understand and apply both approaches critically and contextually. Furthermore, developing monitoring

and evaluation systems capable of capturing physical outputs (characteristic of advancement) and changes in processes, capacities, and power relations (characteristic of empowerment) becomes necessary. This critical reflection, while acknowledging the inherent limitations of an analysis based on secondary data, is likely to trigger further discussion and continuous improvement efforts in social development in Indonesia toward a more transformative and equitable direction.

CONCLUSIONS AND SUGGESTIONS

Based on the results and discussion that have been elaborated in-depth, the conceptualization of community empowerment and community advancement within the context of social development in Indonesia exhibits both fundamental differences and significant intersections. Conceptual analysis affirms that community empowerment inherently emphasizes a shift in power relations, the strengthening of internal agency (capacity, critical awareness, control), and transformative participatory processes oriented towards the independence of the subject. On the other hand, community advancement tends to have a broader scope, focusing on the improvement of quality of life and the collective betterment of socio-economic conditions through planned interventions, which, although they may involve participation and capacity building, do not always automatically champion the agenda of power transformation as their primary goal. Although these core distinctions are identified, the literature synthesis also indicates an overlap in certain elements and a conflation in using both terms within social development discourse, which has implications for practice in the field.

Furthermore, the analysis of the implementation of both approaches in Indonesia reveals patterns of practice that tend to align with these conceptual differences, yet with high complexity and contextual variation. Empowerment-oriented programs tend to prioritize bottom-up participatory mechanisms, facilitation of group strengthening, and a focus on non-physical capacity building, as reflected in some practices of Village Fund utilization or former National Program for Community Empowerment (PNPM) Mandiri models. Conversely, advancement-oriented programs are more often manifested in physical infrastructure development and basic service provision with more centralized or technocratic planning. Nevertheless, a key finding from this analysis is the prevalence of hybrid practices in the field, where programs (such as the overall management of the Village Fund) often attempt to combine physical and non-physical elements, and the strong influence of local contextual factors (leadership, social capital, culture) which significantly determine how a program design—be it empowerment or advancement—is ultimately translated and operates at the community level.

The findings regarding the challenges and opportunities faced in applying both approaches further affirm the complexity of the social development landscape in

Indonesia. Although systemic challenges affect both, such as issues of institutional capacity and sustainability, comparative analysis indicates specific constraints that are more prominent in each respective approach; empowerment grapples with problems of elite capture and the measurement of intangible impacts, while advancement faces risks of misalignment with real needs and low ownership. On the other hand, significant opportunities are present through decentralization policy frameworks such as the Village Law and the potential utilization of information technology. These cumulative findings underscore that a rigid dichotomy between community empowerment and community advancement is inadequate for capturing the reality of social development in Indonesia. Better conceptual clarity is required, not to choose one exclusively, but rather to guide the design of more intelligent, contextual, adaptive intervention strategies that can potentially integrate the best elements of both approaches synergistically to achieve transformative and sustainable social change.

Stemming from these conclusions, several suggestions are proposed for Indonesia's practical and policy social development domains. Policymakers and program designers are encouraged to formulate more straightforward guidelines regarding the differentiation and potential synergy between empowerment and advancement interventions so that resource allocation and activity design can be more precisely targeted according to the intended objectives—a shift in power, improvement of physical conditions, or both. There needs to be sustained investment in capacity building, not only for communities but also for government apparatus at the local level and for field facilitators/mentors to possess a critical understanding and the skills to manage complex and contextual interventions. Furthermore, developing participatory monitoring and evaluation systems that measure physical outputs and changes in processes, capacities, and power dynamics becomes essential for better learning and accountability. The strategic utilization of digital technology and the strengthening of multi-stakeholder collaboration platforms also need to be continuously promoted as efforts to overcome coordination challenges and broaden the positive impacts of programs.

Meanwhile, several directions for future research are recommended for further scholarly development in the sociology of community empowerment and social development studies in Indonesia. Given the limitations of this study, which is based on secondary data, in-depth primary qualitative research (ethnographic case studies) is needed in various diverse local contexts to explore more richly how communities perceive and experience empowerment versus advancement programs and how internal power dynamics and contextual factors mediate their impacts. Longitudinal studies are also necessary to understand the sustainability aspects of various intervention models. Additionally, further research could focus on developing and testing hybrid intervention models that effectively integrate elements of empowerment and advancement and create more valid and reliable indicators

for measuring intangible empowerment outcomes. Critical inquiry into how global discourses on empowerment and advancement are adopted, adapted, or even resisted within the specific contexts of Indonesian social development policy and practice also constitutes a promising area for research.

REFERENCES

- Afnan, D. (2019). Fungsi Humas Desa sebagai Pengelola Informasi di Era Keterbukaan Informasi Publik. *Jurnal Soshum Insentif*, 2(2), 153-163. <https://doi.org/10.36787/jsi.v2i2.135>
- Angriani, B. N., Abdullah, S., & Muhammad, R. (2023). Modal Sosial dan Nafkah Berkelanjutan Komunitas Pemulung: Studi Kasus Kota Makassar. *Journal of Humanity and Social Justice*, 5(2), 124-139. <https://doi.org/10.38026/jhsj.v5i2.25>
- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A Ladder of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Institute of Planners*, 35(4), 216-224. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01944366908977225>
- Arsyad, M., Pulubuhu, D. A. T., Kawamura, Y., Maria, I. L., Dirpan, A., Unde, A. A., Nuddin, A., & Yusuf, S. (2020). The Role of Public Health Services (PHS) in Agricultural Poverty Alleviation. *Enfermería Clínica*, 30(2), 194-197. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.enfcli.2019.07.076>
- Chambers, R. (1997). *Whose Reality Counts? Putting the First Last*. Intermediate Technology Publications.
- Faedlulloh, D. (2018). BUMDes dan Kepemilikan Warga: Membangun Skema Organisasi Partisipatoris. *Journal of Governance: Jurnal Ilmu Pemerintahan Universitas Sultan Ageng Tirtayasa*, 3(1), 1-17. <https://doi.org/10.31506/jog.v3i1.3035>
- Firdaus, S. (2018). Fenomena Elite Capture dalam Pengelolaan Badan Usaha Milik Desa (BUMDes). *Politika: Jurnal Ilmu Politik*, 9(2), 20-37. <https://doi.org/10.14710/politika.9.2.2018.20-37>
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the Oppressed* (Trans. by M. B. Ramos). Herder and Herder.
- Government Regulation in Lieu of Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 2 of 2022 on Job Creation (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2022 Number 238, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6841). <https://peraturan.go.id/id/perppu-no-2-tahun-2022>
- Hababil, M. P., Firdaus, M. K., Nazhmi, N., Hamdani, M. D., Alghifary, M. R., & Fadilla, A. (2024). Analisis Pengaruh Pemerataan Ekonomi dalam Upaya Menghapus Ketimpangan Sosial-Ekonomi Antar Masyarakat. *Journal of Macroeconomics and Social Development*, 1(4), 1-9. <https://doi.org/10.47134/jmsd.v1i4.276>
- Halimah, M., & Karyana, A. (2017). Skala Prioritas Perencanaan Pembangunan dalam Musrenbang Kecamatan. *Jurnal Manajemen Pelayanan Publik*, 1(1), 74-87. <https://doi.org/10.24198/jmpp.v1i1.13544>

- Hidayat, R., Amalia, D. R., & Fitria, D. (2024). The Effectiveness of Village-Owned Enterprise Management in Enhancing Community Economy: A Case Study of Puuroda Village. *SIGn Journal of Social Science*, 5(1), 50-64. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjss.v5i1.407>
- Irmayani, I., Hapsa, H., Marzuki, M., & Bakari, Y. (2023). River Rock Gathering Practices and Their Impact on the Taliabo Village Community. *SIGn Journal of Social Science*, 3(2), 122-136. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjss.v3i2.327>
- Korten, D. C. (1990). *Getting to the 21st Century: Voluntary Action and the Global Agenda*. Kumarian Press.
- Kristanto, T. B. A., & Putri, A. A. (2021). Pengembangan Masyarakat Berbasis Aset sebagai Upaya Pemberdayaan Masyarakat melalui Sektor Wisata Kebugaran di Indonesia. *Journal of Social Development Studies*, 2(2), 43-54. <https://doi.org/10.22146/jsds.2272>
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6 of 2014 on Villages (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2014 Number 7, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5495). <https://www.dpr.go.id/dokumen/jdih/undang-undang/detail/1588>
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6 of 2023 on Enactment of Government Regulation in Lieu of Law Number 2 of 2022 on Job Creation Into Law (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2023 Number 41, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6856). <https://www.dpr.go.id/dokumen/jdih/undang-undang/detail/1825>
- Law of the Republic of Indonesia Number 3 of 2024 on the Second Amendment to Law Number 6 of 2014 on Villages (State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia of 2024 Number 77, Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 6914). <https://www.dpr.go.id/dokumen/jdih/undang-undang/detail/1846>
- Muis, A. (2022). The Local Economic Development Based on Social Capital through Farmer Community. *SIGn Journal of Social Science*, 3(1), 1-13. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjss.v3i1.179>
- Neuman, W. L. (2003). *Metodologi Penelitian Sosial: Pendekatan Kualitatif dan Kuantitatif* (Trans. by E. T. Sofia). PT. Indeks.
- Pulubuhu, D. A. T., Evans, K., Arsyad, M., & Mallongi, A. (2018). Understanding the Perspectives of Village Leaders and Institutions in Transforming Social Conflict into Peace and Health. *Indian Journal of Public Health Research & Development*, 9(3), 314-318. <https://doi.org/10.5958/0976-5506.2018.00244.9>
- Pulubuhu, D. A. T., Sutinah, S., Wati, S., & Adhawaty, S. S. (2019). Strategies for Women's Empowerment in Household Industries in the Province of South Sulawesi. *Review of Behavioral Aspect in Organizations and Society*, 1(2), 167-178. <https://doi.org/10.32770/rbaos.vol1i167-178>
- Purnomo, D. A., Prisilia, H., & Nugroho, H. P. (2022). Pendampingan Pembuatan Desain dan RAB untuk Pembangunan Masjid Baiturrahim Serampon, Licin - Banyuwangi. *Jurnal Abdi Panca Marga*, 3(1), 31-45. <https://doi.org/10.51747/abdipancamarga.v3i1.984>

- Purwanto, N., & Rofiah, C. (2017). Pemberdayaan Usaha Ekonomi Produktif bagi Masyarakat di Kecamatan Ploso Kabupaten Jombang. *Comvice: Journal of Community Service*, 1(1), 29-32. <https://doi.org/10.26533/comvice.v1i1.117>
- Puteri, R. E., & Adi, A. S. (2021). Kerjasama Antara Kepala Desa dengan Badan Permusyawaratan Desa (BPD) dalam Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Tunagrahita di Desa Karangpatihan, Kecamatan Balong, Kabupaten Ponorogo. *Kajian Moral dan Kewarganegaraan*, 9(3), 550-564. <https://doi.org/10.26740/kmkn.v9n3.p550-564>
- Putnam, R. D. (2000). *Bowling Alone: The Collapse and Revival of American Community*. Simon & Schuster.
- Rahmadani, D., Marzuki, M., Bakari, Y., & Muzakkir, A. K. (2024). The Participation of the Kaili Indigenous People and the Bugis Ethnicity in Preserving the Kupatan Ritual of the Java Ethnicity. *SIGn Journal of Social Science*, 4(2), 87-99. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjss.v4i2.335>
- Rakhim, A., Rahmi, R., Jalil, A. R., Syamsuri, A. S., Muhammad, R., Bancong, H., & Burhanuddin, B. (2021). Pemberdayaan Masyarakat dalam Instalasi Air Bersih di Desa Bulu Cindea Kabupaten Pangkep. *Jurnal Aplikasi dan Inovasi Iptek (JASINTEK)*, 3(1), 21-27. <https://doi.org/10.52232/jasintek.v3i1.71>
- Resdiana, E., & Puspaningrum, I. I. (2020). Efektifitas Dana Desa dalam Mendukung Pemberdayaan Masyarakat di Desa Marengan Daya Kabupaten Sumenep. *Public Corner*, 15(1), 48-60. <https://doi.org/10.24929/fisip.v15i1.1039>
- Sabarisman, M. (2017). Identifikasi dan Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Miskin Pesisir. *Sosio Informa*, 3(3), 216-235. <https://doi.org/10.33007/inf.v3i3.707>
- Suharto, E. (2005). *Membangun Masyarakat Memberdayakan Rakyat: Kajian Strategis Pembangunan Kesejahteraan Sosial & Pekerjaan Sosial*. Refika Aditama.
- Syah, A. Y. (2022). Pemberdayaan Masyarakat melalui Digital Marketing sebagai Media Promosi Era Pandemi Covid-19 di UMKM Kelurahan Muarasari. *Almujtamae: Jurnal Pengabdian Masyarakat*, 2(3), 215-223. <https://doi.org/10.30997/almujtamae.v2i3.5468>
- Triatmanto, B., Apriyanto, G., Hidayatullah, S., Sufiyanto, S., Harmono, H., Yuniarti, S., Amrulla, M. F., & Alvianna, S. (2024). *Model Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Holistik: Berorientasi Potensi Lokal*. Uwais Inspirasi Indonesia.
- Trisusilo, F. J., & Hermawan, Y. (2025). *Pemberdayaan Komunitas di Desa Wisata (Harmoni Tradisi dan Modernisasi)*. Bayfa Cendekia Indonesia.
- Ulandari, U., Azhari, A., & Hidayat, R. (2024). Integration of Sustainable Development Goals into the Popalia Village Government Work Plan. *SIGn Journal of Social Science*, 4(2), 100-113. <https://doi.org/10.37276/sjss.v4i2.336>
- Utami, N., Saragih, R. F., Daulay, M., Maulana, M. D., & Ramadani, P. (2023). Pembangunan Berkelanjutan: Pengelolaan Sumber Daya Alam Berbasis Pembangunan Sosial dan Ekonomi Indonesia. *Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, 2(1), 46-59. <https://doi.org/10.55606/jimas.v2i1.143>