



9th International Da'wah Conference
Shaping the Future of Da'wah:
Addressing Inequality, Advancing
Inclusive Societies, and Driving
Sustainable Development

Replicating the Inclusive Village Program in Wukirsari Village, Imogiri, Bantul: A Participatory Action Research Approach

Suharto¹, Siti Aminah², Halimatus Sa'diyah³, Muhammad Abu Suhud⁴, Ratna Puspitasari⁵, Miatun Nur Khasanah⁶, Zakiyyatul Fakhroh⁷, Zakiyah Bah⁸, Rahwa Maryam Az-Zahra⁹, Muhammad Nugrahatama Bagus Budiman¹⁰

¹²³⁴⁵⁶⁷⁸⁹¹⁰Islamic Community Development Study Program, Faculty of Da'wah and Communication, State Islamic University Sunan Kalikaga Yogyakarta

suharto@uin-suka.ac.id

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords:

Inclusive village, disability, participatory action research, community empowerment, program replication

ABSTRACT

This article describes the replication process of the disability-inclusive village program in Wukirsari Village, Imogiri, Bantul, Yogyakarta Special Region. The replication was carried out by the Islamic Community Development Study Program, Sunan Kalijaga State Islamic University, Yogyakarta, together with six students who participated in the Community Development Practice I (September–December 2024) and II (February–June 2025) courses. Using the Participatory Action Research (PAR) approach, students actively engaged with their academic supervisor and disability organizations in introducing, advocating for, and facilitating village government to develop inclusive policies. The process included introducing the inclusive village concept, participatory observation, strengthening networks with local disability organizations, and conducting an inclusive village socialization event with village officials. The results show an increase in awareness of disability rights, a commitment from village authorities to develop an inclusive village, the initiation of a Village Disability Group, and the declaration of an Inclusive Village during the village anniversary celebration. These findings highlight that the PAR method is effective in promoting inclusive village replication by positioning students, disability communities, and village governments as collaborative actors.

Introduction

Social inclusion of persons with disabilities has increasingly become a concern at both regional and national levels in Indonesia. Since the ratification of the Convention on the Rights of Persons with Disabilities (CRPD) via Law No. 19 of 2011, the Indonesian government has been obliged to ensure the fulfilment, protection, and respect for the rights of persons with disabilities across all aspects of development. (Kementerian Sosial RI, 2011). This obligation aligns directly with the Sustainable Development Goals (SDGs) 2030 agenda, which emphasises the principle of “leave no one behind” by including vulnerable groups—such as persons with disabilities—in development processes (United Nations, 2015).

Despite this normative framework, at the village level many persons with disabilities are still perceived more as beneficiaries of charity rather than as rights-holders. Research shows that many village governments lack accurate data on persons with disabilities and lack

integrated programs for them in their Village Medium-Term Development Plans (RPJMDes). For example, Prihatiningsih (2021) found that accurate disability data was often absent and that the inclusive dimension of village development planning remained weak. This situation persists even though Law No. 6 of 2014 on Villages provides scope for village governments to develop citizen-based policies—including for persons with disabilities.

In response to this gap, the Sasana Inklusi dan Gerakan Advokasi Difabel (SIGAB) Indonesia introduced the “Inclusive Village” model for persons with disabilities in 2014. The model emphasises the mainstreaming of disability issues in village governance: from development planning, budget allocation, accessibility provision, to the participation of persons with disabilities in village deliberations (SIGAB Indonesia, 2019). The pilot phase (called RINDI) began in 2015 in six villages in Lendah sub-district, Kulon Progo, and two villages in Sleman Regency. Since 2022, under the “SOLIDER (Strengthening Social Inclusion for Disability Equity and Rights)” programme, the model has been replicated in six other villages in Kulon Progo, six in Bantul, eight in Situbondo (East Java), six in Kupang and six in Rote Ndao (East Nusa Tenggara). In 2024 further replications were conducted in Cirebon (West Java) and Rejang Lebong (Bengkulu). One best-practice example is Palbapang Village in Bantul, which has become a reference site for other villages. Through this process, SIGAB developed its indicators for a disability-inclusive village from nine to eleven, namely: (1) inclusive population data; (2) inclusive public information and communication systems; (3) inclusive village community institutions; (4) participation of persons with disabilities; (5) inclusive village policies; (6) inclusive budgeting; (7) inclusive basic services; (8) disability-friendly infrastructure; (9) inclusive attitudes/behaviours; (10) opportunities to become village officials; and (11) inter-stakeholder collaboration (Suharto, 2025).

The replication of the inclusive-village model is viewed as essential to ensure this social innovation does not remain limited to demonstration sites but is disseminated through processes of adaptation and participatory accompaniment (Rogers, 2003). In higher education settings—where one of the tri-dharmas is community service—the replication of inclusive village models can serve as a platform for lecturer and student engagement in community service, thereby strengthening the resonance of inclusivity in villages. In this vein, the Islamic Community Development Study Program of the Faculty of Da'wah and Communication, Sunan Kalijaga State Islamic University Yogyakarta (UIN Sunan Kalijaga Yogyakarta) has applied a Participatory Action Research (PAR) approach to replicate the inclusive village

programme for persons with disabilities because PAR is able to facilitate collaboration among students, academics, disability organisations, and village governments as agents of change (Kendon, Pain, & Kesby, 2007). PAR enables a “learning by doing” process whereby lecturers and students are not merely researchers or observers but facilitators directly involved in social transformation (Rahardjo, 2022). Moreover, the replication of the inclusive village model led by lecturers and students serves not only as a field of community service but also as a social laboratory where students directly apply the community development knowledge and skills acquired on campus (Horton & Freire, 1990; Kendon, Pain, & Kesby, 2007). Through real-world engagement—facing barriers, challenges, setbacks, and progress alike—students develop greater professional maturity, reflexivity, and competence as future community development practitioners (Reason & Bradbury, 2008; Chambers, 2017).

The chosen field site is Wukirsari village, Imogiri sub-district, Bantul Regency of Yogyakarta Special Region. This site is selected for its strong community base in arts, culture, social institutions, and citizen participation. Wukirsari village has even received international recognition as one of the world’s 55 best tourism villages (The Best Tourism Village 2024 by United Nations World Tourism Organization) and was designated as an Intellectual Property-Based Area in 2025 by the Ministry of Law and Human Rights (Antara, 2024; Pemerintah Kabupaten Bantul, 2025). However, prior to intervention, disability issues had not been a primary concern in village development planning. Initial conditions indicated structural impediments: lack of accurate disability data, absence of a disability organisation at the village level, limited physical accessibility in public spaces, all constraining the socioeconomic participation of persons with disabilities and limiting the village government’s attention to disability issues (student field findings from 2024–2025 PPM – Community Development Practice). Therefore, the replication of the inclusive-village model in Wukirsari is both relevant and significant, for strengthening the capacity of the village government and empowering the local disability community.

Through the involvement of lecturers and six students from the Islamic Community Development Study Program, who carried out the Community Development Practice I and II in 2024–2025, this replication is not only an academic learning opportunity but a tangible contribution of the university to community service. Under the supervision of a faculty supervisor who is also Chair of the SIGAB Indonesia Board and author of the “Inclusive Village for Persons with Disabilities Guidebook” (Suharto, 2025), the students served as catalytic

agents connecting the village government, the disability community, and the broader community in promoting the achievement of an inclusive village in Wukirsari.

In sum, this article aims to present the process, outcomes, challenges, and lessons learned from replicating the inclusive-village model in Wukirsari village using a PAR approach. It offers practical implications for village governments, disability organisations, higher education institutions, and practitioners seeking to advance disability inclusion in village development.

Literature Review

Research on social inclusion of persons with disabilities in Indonesia indicates that despite supportive laws (e.g., Law No. 8/2016 on Persons with Disabilities) and growing awareness, implementation remains uneven. A recent literature review found that key obstacles include inaccessible infrastructure, limited qualified personnel, and persistent stigma associated with disability (Huripah, 2024). Studies focusing on village-level inclusion emphasise the importance of participation by vulnerable groups in village development (Ro'fah et al., 2022) and highlight how social capital fosters collaboration between communities, local governments, and disability groups in building inclusive governance structures and strengthening creative-economy linkages (Budirahayu et al., 2025). These studies collectively demonstrate that inclusive participation and strong social networks are key drivers for sustaining community-based inclusion initiatives at the village level. Similarly, research on replication of inclusive village models in Kulon Progo (e.g., Bumirejo Village) show initial practice but limited rigorous academic documentation especially regarding the replication process and roles of higher education (Nugraheni, 2018). In addition, literature on PAR in village empowerment contexts confirms the value of participatory methodologies for transformation (Soedarwo et al., 2022).

Nevertheless, there remain several gaps. First, there is scant research documenting the replication process of inclusive village models—how adaptation occurs in new sites, what supports or hinders scale-up, and what learning loops are involved. Second, although higher education institutions are often engaged in community service, there is limited scholarly work exploring their role as co-facilitators in inclusive village replication, particularly linking student engagement, village government, and disability communities. Third, there is a limited empirical focus on structured indicators (such as those of SIGAB) within real-world village

replication settings, particularly in the Indonesian context, and how these indicators evolve across different replications. Fourth, the village of Wukirsari presents a unique setting (strong cultural base, tourism designation) but there is no prior study analysing its readiness, barriers, and transformation process regarding inclusion of persons with disabilities.

In light of the above, this study is guided by the following research questions: (1) How is the inclusive-village model (as developed by SIGAB) adapted and implemented in Wukirsari village through a participatory action research approach? (2) What are the principal enabling factors and obstacles encountered in the process of replicating the inclusive-village model in this specific village context? (3) How do the SIGAB eleven indicators manifest in Wukirsari village both before and after intervention, and what changes emerge in terms of disability data, accessibility, participation, and institutionalisation? (4) What role do university students, lecturers, the village government, and disability organisations play as actors of change in this replication process?

This study contributes to the literature in several ways. Firstly, it provides empirical documentation of the replication of an inclusive-village model at a village site that has not previously been studied (Wukirsari, Bantul), thereby addressing the gap in replication research. Secondly, it examines the active role of a higher education institution via a PAR approach—linking student-community engagement with village governance and disability advocacy—which has been under-represented in Indonesian studies. Thirdly, it applies and critically examines the eleven-indicator framework developed by SIGAB in a field replication context, generating insights into its validity, adaptation, and impact. Finally, by focusing on a village with a strong tourism-cultural identity, the study explores how inclusive development interacts with local socio-cultural assets, adding nuance to the discussion of inclusive village models in diverse village typologies.

Methods

Research Design: Participatory Action Research (PAR)

This study employed a Participatory Action Research (PAR) approach, in which researchers, students, persons with disabilities, and local government officials acted as equal

subjects in a collective process of social transformation (McTaggart, 1997; Kindon, Pain, & Kesby, 2007). PAR is defined as a collaborative and democratic research methodology that integrates action, reflection, and participation to generate practical knowledge aimed at social change (Kemmis, McTaggart, & Nixon, 2014). Unlike conventional research that positions communities as objects of study, PAR recognizes them as co-researchers who jointly identify problems, plan actions, implement interventions, and evaluate outcomes.

Conceptually, PAR is grounded in Paulo Freire's (1970) critical pedagogy of liberation, which emphasizes dialogical learning and the cultivation of critical consciousness (*conscientização*) to challenge structural injustice. Within social research, PAR bridges academic knowledge and community experience to co-produce contextually relevant and transformative outcomes (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005; Wadsworth, 1998).

The distinctive features of PAR include:

1. Active participation – all stakeholders are engaged throughout the research cycle, from problem identification to evaluation.
2. Action–reflection cycles – iterative processes of planning, action, observation, and reflection guide the evolution of knowledge and practice.
3. Social transformation – the primary aim is not merely the production of knowledge but the promotion of equitable and inclusive social change.
4. Collaborative partnership – PAR involves multiple actors (academics, students, village government, organizations of people with disabilities, and community members) as equal partners (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005; Wadsworth, 1998).

This approach aligns closely with the inclusive village development framework, which requires active participation of persons with disabilities in decision-making processes. Therefore, the outcomes of this study are both academically informative and practically significant in strengthening the agency and inclusion of persons with disabilities in local governance (Suharto, 2020; Budirahayu et al., 2025).

Research Site and Duration

The research was conducted in Wukirsari Village, Imogiri Subdistrict, Bantul Regency, Yogyakarta Special Region, from September 2024 to June 2025. The site was selected due to its ongoing efforts toward disability-inclusive governance and active community engagement in local development initiatives.

Research Participants

The research participants consisted of:

- Six undergraduate students of the Islamic Community Development Study Program, UIN Sunan Kalijaga.
- The Head and Secretary of the Study Program, along with a supervising lecturer who also serves as the Chair of SIGAB Indonesia and author of the *Inclusive Village for Persons with Disabilities Guidebook*.
- The Wukirsari Village Government representatives.
- Disabled community leaders from Sapadifa Imogiri, village-based disability activists, and members of the inter-village disability network in Bantul–Kulon Progo.

PAR Cycles and Phases

The PAR process was implemented through two interrelated cycles of community engagement (PPM 1 and PPM 2) following the classic stages of planning, action, observation, reflection, and re-planning (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005):

1. Problem identification and conceptual introduction – students attended preparatory lectures on the concept of the inclusive village, conducted by the supervising lecturer.
2. Participatory observation – mapping of village institutions, disability-related budget allocations, data collection on public infrastructure accessibility, and interviews with local disability leaders.
3. Collective reflection – involving Sapadifa Imogiri leaders and expanding student networks with district-level disability groups.
4. Social action – conducting public awareness sessions on inclusive village development with experts (i.e. the Chair of SIGAB Indonesia and author of the *Inclusive Village for Persons with Disabilities Guidebook*) and practitioners (i.e. Head of Palbapang Village, Bantul Regency).
5. Evaluation and follow-up planning – implemented through *focus group discussions (FGDs)* to formulate sustainability strategies.
6. Institutionalization – initiation of the Village Disability Group and declaration of Wukirsari as an inclusive village.

The first cycle (PPM 1, September–December 2024) focused on engagement, data collection, accessibility observation, and trust-building with community stakeholders. The second cycle (PPM 2, February–June 2025) emphasized action and transformation, including

advocacy, capacity-building, and facilitation of the disability group formation at the village level.

Data Collection Methods and Triangulation

Data were collected using multiple qualitative methods to ensure depth and validity:

- Participant observation during village meetings, community events, and accessibility audits.
- Semi-structured interviews with government officials, disability activists, and academic partners.
- Focus Group Discussion (FGD) to synthesize diverse perspectives and reflect on action outcomes.
- Document analysis of policy documents, budget reports, and institutional records related to disability inclusion.

To enhance the credibility and trustworthiness of findings, this study applied data triangulation (Denzin, 1978; Patton, 2015). Triangulation was conducted across:

1. Data sources (students, community leaders, local government).
2. Methods (interview, observation, documentation).
3. Researchers (students and academic supervisors cross-validating field notes).

Triangulation not only minimizes researcher bias but also strengthens interpretive validity in participatory settings (Flick, 2018).

Data Analysis

Data were analyzed using thematic analysis integrated with participatory reflection (Braun & Clarke, 2006; Kemmis et al., 2014). The process involved:

1. Data familiarization through transcription and reading of field notes.
2. Coding of recurring themes related to participation, inclusion, and empowerment.
3. Collaborative interpretation during reflection meetings involving all stakeholders.
4. Synthesis of findings linking empirical data to theoretical constructs of inclusive development.

This participatory analysis ensured that interpretations remained grounded in the lived experiences and aspirations of persons with disabilities, consistent with PAR's emancipatory orientation (Kendon et al., 2007; Cornwall & Jewkes, 1995).

Results

Adaptation and Implementation of the Inclusive-Village Model through Participatory Action Research (RQ1)

The replication of SIGAB's inclusive-village (*desa inklusif*) model in Wukirsari Village, Bantul Regency, followed a participatory action research (PAR) cycle emphasizing co-learning, reflection, and collaborative action. The process began with a participatory mapping exercise that successfully identified 158–162 persons with disabilities across various categories—physical, sensory (visual and hearing), intellectual, and psychosocial. This initial stage not only generated baseline data but also enabled local stakeholders to recognize the presence and diversity of disability within the community—an essential first step in building inclusive awareness (Kemmis & McTaggart, 2005; Kindon et al., 2007).

Throughout the PAR cycles, students from UIN Sunan Kalijaga, guided by their academic supervisor and supported by the village government, conducted asset mapping, participatory observation, and reflective discussions to identify institutional barriers and potential enablers. Initially, students expressed doubt about their ability to mobilize the community, as support from village stakeholders appeared limited. However, engagement with Sapadifa Imogiri, a disability organization in sub-district level, and participation in inter-district disability forums (Bantul–Kulon Progo) provided renewed confidence and practical insights into community organizing. This cross-learning reflected the reflexive dimension of PAR, where participants reinterpret their roles as both learners and agents of change (Freire, 1970; Cornwall & Jewkes, 1995).

As the process advanced, collaborative workshops and public dialogues facilitated by students, lecturers, and village officials provided a shared platform for learning about disability rights, accessibility, and inclusive governance. These events translated theoretical understanding into collective local commitment—signifying the adaptation of the SIGAB model from normative policy discourse into contextually grounded village action.

Enabling Factors and Obstacles in the Replication Process (RQ2)

The adaptation of the inclusive-village model in Wukirsari was influenced by several enabling and constraining factors.

Enabling factors included:

1. Academic facilitation and mentoring – The presence of university lecturers and students as knowledge brokers strengthened participatory learning and enhanced the credibility of the initiative.

2. Peer learning and networking – Visits to Sapadifa Imogiri and participation in district-level disability forums expanded local understanding of best practices and demonstrated that an inclusive village was achievable.
3. Dialogical spaces – Activities such as focus group discussion, informal reflection sessions, and the public seminar on 19 May 2025 helped bridge communication between the disability community and local authorities, fostering mutual trust.
4. Emerging political will – The *Lurah* (Village Head) and sub-village leaders (*Dukuh*) expressed explicit support after witnessing the social momentum of the initiative.

Conversely, key obstacles were identified:

- Structural poverty and economic marginalization that limited the participation of persons with disabilities in village forums.
- Persistent social stigma associating disability with dependence or charity, which initially hindered open involvement.
- Institutional inertia, as some village apparatus were unfamiliar with inclusive governance principles and had not yet integrated disability perspectives into existing village planning instruments.

These challenges resonate with previous findings that PAR-based community initiatives must confront both material and symbolic dimensions of exclusion (Cooke & Kothari, 2001; Suharto, 2020).

Manifestation of the SIGAB Eleven Indicators and Evident Transformations (RQ3)

Before intervention, Wukirsari village exhibited weak institutional structures for disability inclusion:

- Disability data were fragmented and informal. The absence of the Washington Group Questions in the disability identification process resulted in the non-registration of individuals with invisible or less apparent impairments, such as psychosocial, intellectual, or chronic health-related disabilities.
- Accessibility audits revealed limited physical access to public spaces such as village offices and community halls. Although ramps are available in some public facilities, including the village hall, their slopes fail to meet the recommended accessibility standards (1:12 or 1:10). Furthermore, no public facility in the area is equipped with toilets accessible to wheelchair users, indicating that physical accessibility remains largely inadequate.

- Participation of persons with disabilities in decision-making was minimal and primarily consultative. Persons with disabilities have been invited to participate individually in the Village Development Planning Meeting (*Musrenbangkal*). Nevertheless, their involvement has not taken the form of collective representation, and thus their participation has yet to reflect or convey the shared aspirations and advocacy agenda of the broader disability community.
- Institutional representation was absent, as no formal disability group existed at the village level. At present, Wukirsari Village has not yet established a *Village Disability Group* (*Kelompok Difabel Kalurahan*, KDK) with institutional status equivalent to other Village Community Institutions (*Lembaga Kemasyarakatan Kalurahan*). Furthermore, existing community institutions remain non-inclusive and have yet to provide formal mechanisms for representing or advocating the interests of persons with disabilities.

Following the PAR-based intervention, several key transformations aligned with SIGAB's Eleven Indicators of Inclusive Village Development (Suharto, 2025) became visible:

1. **Enhanced awareness and political commitment** – Through the inclusive-village socialization event (19 May 2025) attended by the Head of Palbapang Village—a recognized model of best practice—the Wukirsari government and community leaders committed to adopting the inclusive-village framework.
2. **Integration into village planning** – The village government pledged to incorporate disability inclusion within the *Medium-Term Village Development Plan (RPJMDes)* and to allocate specific budget lines for disability programs.
3. **Institutionalization of participation** – The step towards formation of a Village Disability Group (*Kelompok Difabel Kalurahan*) marked a structural milestone, providing an advocacy and participatory platform for the local disability community.
4. **Community-level inclusion** – During the village anniversary, the Inclusive Village Declaration symbolized not only ceremonial commitment but also social recognition of persons with disabilities as equal citizens.

Quantitatively, the disability mapping improved data validity, and qualitatively, participation expanded from passive consultation to co-decision-making roles in planning and evaluation stages. Accessibility improvements and institutional visibility thus reflected a measurable advancement toward SIGAB's indicator-based inclusivity framework.

Roles of University, Village Government, and Disability Organizations as Agents of Change (RQ4)

The replication process in Wukirsari illustrated a multi-actor synergy characteristic of participatory action research.

- **University students** served as facilitators, researchers, and community organizers. Their experiential engagement fostered mutual learning, combining academic theory with social practice.
- **Lecturers** functioned as mediators and mentors, ensuring methodological rigor, reflective cycles, and sustained collaboration with community actors.
- The **Village Government** acted as both a gatekeeper and enabler; its endorsement was crucial in legitimizing the process and mobilizing institutional resources.
- **Disability organizations** such as Sapadifa Imogiri and other Bantul–Kulon Progo networks played catalytic roles in transferring knowledge, mentoring new leaders, and modeling inclusive governance practices.
- The **Head of Palbapang Village, Bantul**, acted as both a mentor and catalyst in facilitating Wukirsari's transformation toward inclusion. As Palbapang Village has been recognized as a benchmark for disability-inclusive governance, it serves as a reference model for other villages in Bantul Regency aspiring to replicate the inclusive-village framework.

This constellation of actors demonstrates what Kemmis, McTaggart, and Nixon (2014) describe as communicative *action*, where diverse participants engage in dialogue to reach mutual understanding and collective transformation. In this sense, the inclusive-village initiative in Wukirsari was not merely a technical replication but a co-constructed process of local empowerment and institutional learning.

Summary of Outcomes

By the conclusion of the PAR cycle (June 2025), Wukirsari village had transitioned from limited disability awareness to emerging institutional inclusion. The combined processes of participatory mapping, reflective dialogue, and social mobilization resulted in:

- Increased public and governmental awareness of disability rights.
- Formation of a village-level disability organization.
- Integration of inclusive principles into formal village planning.

- Strengthened cross-sector collaboration between university, government, and civil society actors.

These outcomes suggest that the replication of SIGAB's inclusive-village model through a participatory action research approach can effectively catalyze both attitudinal and structural change when rooted in sustained dialogue, reflexivity, and institutional commitment.

Discussion

The findings of this study demonstrate that the replication of the *inclusive-village model* developed by SIGAB in Wukirsari village was facilitated through a participatory action research (PAR) approach that effectively integrated multi-stakeholder collaboration. The adaptation process involved iterative cycles of reflection and action, where village authorities, persons with disabilities, university lecturers, and students collectively identified local barriers and co-created context-specific solutions. This participatory mechanism enabled the inclusive-village model to move beyond normative policy discourse toward tangible social and institutional transformation at the village level.

In the context of Wukirsari, the PAR process functioned as a practical learning arena for university students while simultaneously serving as an empowerment platform for the disability community. The students' involvement went beyond internship requirements; they acted as *facilitators of social change* (Rahardjo, 2022), mediating between academic frameworks, policy structures, and lived community realities. Through participatory mapping, the research team identified 158–162 persons with disabilities, encompassing physical, sensory, and psychosocial categories—yet persons with invisible impairments often remained unregistered, reflecting the continuing methodological and social limitations of local data collection.

The implementation of the inclusive-village model in Wukirsari revealed several enabling factors. First, the existence of strong social networks connecting local governments, disability groups, and academia proved essential for knowledge diffusion and collective action. The involvement of *Sapadifa Imogiri* and disability forums from Bantul and Kulon Progo provided concrete inspiration and mentoring, reinforcing Rogers' (2003) *diffusion of innovation* framework that emphasizes the role of inter-actor relations in the dissemination of social innovations. Second, the presence of leadership support—particularly from the *Head of Palbapang Village*, who acted as a mentor and catalyst—helped strengthen institutional

commitment. Palbapang Village's recognition as a benchmark for inclusive governance motivated Wukirsari's leaders to replicate similar structures and practices. Third, academic engagement through lecturers and students generated a continuous learning ecosystem, aligning with the principles of *transformative PAR* where research becomes an intervention tool for empowerment and institutional change (Kendon, Pain, & Kesby, 2007).

Nevertheless, the replication process also encountered significant obstacles. Despite the village's progress in disability identification and awareness-raising, accessibility remained limited. Public buildings such as the village hall were equipped with ramps, but the gradient did not meet national accessibility standards (1:12 or 1:10), and no public toilets were wheelchair-accessible. During the first year Wukirsari had yet to establish a Village Disability Group (*Kelompok Difabel Kalurahan*, KDK) with formal status equivalent to other Village Community Institutions (*Lembaga Kemasyarakatan Kalurahan*). Nevertheless, the Wukirsari Village Government has selected potential participants for the Village Disability Group (*Kelompok Difabel Kalurahan*, KDK), which is expected to be formally established later this year (2025). Moreover, existing community organizations remained non-inclusive and did not adequately represent disability voices in policymaking forums. The *Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan Kalurahan* (village development planning meeting) often included individual persons with disabilities, but their participation was symbolic rather than representative, as they did not articulate collective disability aspirations. This condition results from the absence of an established Village Disability Group in Wukirsari. Even so, the participation of individuals with disabilities signifies an emerging commitment to inclusive policymaking.

Regarding the SIGAB eleven indicators, first-year intervention results demonstrate limited but significant progress. Disability data collection and awareness improved substantially, accessibility infrastructure began to emerge despite technical shortcomings, and community participation increased through inclusive forums and socialization activities. Institutionalisation was initiated through the government's commitment to integrate disability inclusion into the *RPJMDes* (Village Medium-Term Development Plan) and to allocate specific funding. The *Declaration of Inclusive Wukirsari Village*, held during the village anniversary celebration, symbolized a collective commitment among local government, community leaders, and persons with disabilities to uphold inclusive governance principles.

From a theoretical standpoint, these findings resonate with Zimmerman's (2000) *empowerment theory*, which underscores that active participation enhances individuals' sense of

control and collective efficacy. The Wukirsari case illustrates how empowerment emerges when community members, supported by academic facilitation, engage in both decision-making and implementation processes. The interaction among local government, academia, and civil society demonstrates a dynamic of *co-production* of inclusion, where power and knowledge are negotiated rather than imposed.

In conclusion, the replication of the inclusive-village model in Wukirsari village affirms that PAR can accelerate the institutionalization of inclusive governance when it is underpinned by social networks, mentoring systems, and multi-actor collaboration. Yet sustainability remains a central challenge. Future progress will depend on the consolidation of the Village Disability Group, the institutional mainstreaming of disability issues within the RPJMDes, and the establishment of accessible infrastructure that meets universal design standards.

Conclusion

The replication of the *inclusive-village model* developed by SIGAB in Wukirsari Village demonstrates the effectiveness of the *participatory action research* (PAR) approach in fostering social transformation through inclusive and collaborative community development. The process has resulted in significant progress across multiple dimensions: the enhancement of disability awareness, the emergence of political and social commitment from the village government, the initiation of local disability institutionalisation, and the formal declaration of Wukirsari as an *inclusive village*. These outcomes affirm that inclusion-oriented community transformation can occur when participatory methods are embedded in local governance structures and when multi-actor collaboration—among university students, lecturers, civil society organisations, and village authorities—is actively sustained.

The study highlights that PAR not only facilitates collective learning and empowerment but also functions as a catalyst for institutional change. University students, guided by lecturers and supported by local disability organisations, acted as agents of change who bridged academic frameworks with grassroots realities. Their participatory engagement enabled persons with disabilities to articulate their aspirations more effectively, while simultaneously encouraging the village government to incorporate inclusive principles into policy discourse. This dynamic confirms that the synergy between academia and community actors can accelerate the localisation of the inclusive-village model.

However, the findings also indicate that sustaining inclusion requires long-term engagement. While symbolic achievements—such as the *Declaration of Inclusive Wukirsari Village*—mark important milestones, enduring transformation depends on institutional consolidation, policy integration, and continued technical support. The challenges identified include limited accessibility infrastructure, the absence of a formal *Village Disability Group* (*Kelompok Difabel Kalurahan*, KDK) with institutional legitimacy, and the need for consistent budget allocation and inclusion mainstreaming in the *RPJMDes* (Village Medium-Term Development Plan).

Importantly, the *community development practice course* functions as a continuous and cumulative learning process that strengthens these outcomes over time. In its second year, a new cohort of seven students continues the foundational work initiated by the first-year group. These students are conducting a more refined round of disability data collection using the *Washington Group Questions* integrated into the *Sensus Sosial Ekonomi dan Kesehatan* (SESONOAN) platform, piloted in several sub-villages of Wukirsari. This ongoing engagement ensures longitudinal learning, data improvement, and policy relevance—transforming the academic practicum into a sustained mechanism of community accompaniment and evidence-based advocacy.

In summary, this research affirms that the replication of the inclusive-village model through PAR is not a one-time intervention but an evolving social process. The collaboration between academia, local government, and disability organisations has laid the groundwork for institutional inclusion, yet continuous facilitation, mentoring, and policy integration remain essential to consolidate progress.

Practical Recommendations:

1. **Institutionalisation:** The Wukirsari Village Government should formally establish the *Village Disability Group* (*Kelompok Difabel Kalurahan*) to secure official recognition and ensure access to the village budget.
2. **Capacity Strengthening:** Continuous training and regular meetings are required to enhance the organisational and advocacy capacity of the disability group.
3. **Accessible Infrastructure:** Gradual improvement of public facilities—such as ramps with standard gradients, accessible toilets, guiding paths, and Braille signage—should be prioritised to meet universal design standards.

4. **Policy Mainstreaming:** Inclusive development programmes should be explicitly integrated into the RPJMDes to guarantee policy continuity beyond leadership transitions.

References

- Antara. (2024, May 19). *Desa Wukirsari Bantul meraih penghargaan Best Tourism Village dari PBB* [Wukirsari Village in Bantul receives Best Tourism Village award from the UN]. <https://jogja.antaranews.com/berita/725601/desa-wukirsari-bantul-meraih-penghargaan-best-tourism-village-dari-pbb>
- Braun, V., & Clarke, V. (2006). Using thematic analysis in psychology. *Qualitative Research in Psychology*, 3(2), 77–101. <https://doi.org/10.1191/1478088706qp063oa>
- Budirahayu, T., Mawardi, R. A., Sutinah, Fitri, M., & Rahayu, E. (2025). Inclusive villages and creative economy development: Analysis of social capital in MSME communities in Sidoarjo Regency. *Jurnal Mengkaji Indonesia*, 4(1), 27–52. <https://jurnal.erapublikasi.id/index.php/JMI/article/view/1128>
- Chambers, R. (2017). *Can we know better? Reflections for development*. Practical Action Publishing.
- Cooke, B., & Kothari, U. (Eds.). (2001). *Participation: The new tyranny?* Zed Books.
- Cornwall, A., & Jewkes, R. (1995). What is participatory research? *Social Science & Medicine*, 41(12), 1667–1676. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536\(95\)00127-S](https://doi.org/10.1016/0277-9536(95)00127-S)
- Denzin, N. K. (1978). *The research act: A theoretical introduction to sociological methods*. McGraw-Hill.
- Flick, U. (2018). *An introduction to qualitative research* (6th ed.). Sage.
- Freire, P. (1970). *Pedagogy of the oppressed*. Continuum.
- Freire, P., & Horton, M. (1990). *We make the road by walking: Conversations on education and social change*. Temple University Press.
- Huripah, E. (2025). Comprehensive literature analysis on social inclusion for persons with disabilities in Indonesia. *International Journal on Society Reviews*, 3(2), Article 351. <https://injoser.joln.org/index.php/123/article/view/351>
- Kementerian Sosial Republik Indonesia. (2011). *Undang-Undang Nomor 19 Tahun 2011 tentang Pengesahan CRPD* [Law No. 19 of 2011 on the Ratification of the CRPD]. Kementerian Sosial.

- Kemmis, S., & McTaggart, R. (2005). Participatory action research: Communicative action and the public sphere. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of qualitative research* (3rd ed., pp. 559–603). Sage.
- Kemmis, S., McTaggart, R., & Nixon, R. (2014). *The action research planner: Doing critical participatory action research*. Springer. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-981-4560-67-2>
- Kindon, S., Pain, R., & Kesby, M. (2007). *Participatory action research approaches and methods: Connecting people, participation and place*. Routledge.
- McTaggart, R. (1997). *Participatory action research: International contexts and consequences*. State University of New York Press.
- Nugraheni, T. A. (2018). *Participation of people with disability in inclusion village development: The case in Bumirejo Village, Lendah District, Kulonprogo Regency* [Unpublished master's thesis]. International Program of Government Affairs and Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Muhammadiyah Yogyakarta.
- Pemerintah Kabupaten Bantul. (2025, September 2). *Wukirsari ditetapkan sebagai kawasan berbasis kekayaan intelektual tahun 2025 oleh Kemenkum RI* [Wukirsari designated as an intellectual property-based area for 2025 by the Ministry of Law and Human Rights]. <https://bantulkab.go.id/berita/detail/7007/wukirsari-ditetapkan-sebagai-kawasan-berbasis-kekayaan-intelektual-tahun-2025-oleh-kemenkum-ri.html>
- Patton, M. Q. (2015). *Qualitative research & evaluation methods: Integrating theory and practice* (4th ed.). Sage.
- Prihatiningsih, N. (2021). Desa inklusif sebagai model pembangunan berbasis hak difabel [Inclusive villages as a model for disability rights-based development]. *Jurnal Pemberdayaan Masyarakat*, 5(2), 123–137.
- Rahardjo, T. (2022). *Mahasiswa sebagai agen perubahan sosial: Refleksi atas praktik pengabdian masyarakat* [Students as agents of social change: Reflections on community service practices]. Pustaka Pelajar.
- Reason, P., & Bradbury, H. (Eds.). (2008). *The Sage handbook of action research: Participative inquiry and practice* (2nd ed.). Sage.
- Ro'fah, R. F., Hanjarwati, A., & Suprihatiningrum, J. (2022). The long road to social inclusion: Participation of vulnerable groups in village development. *Jurnal Pemberdayaan*

- Masyarakat: *Media Pemikiran dan Dakwah Pembangunan*, 6(2), 199–220. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jpm.v6i2.2022> (Note: DOI inferred; verify if available)
- Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
- SIGAB Indonesia. (2019). *Model desa inklusif* [Model of inclusive villages]. SIGAB Indonesia.
- SIGAB Indonesia. (2021). *Indikator desa inklusif difabel* [Indicators of disability-inclusive villages]. SIGAB Indonesia.
- Soedarwo, V. S. D., Hayat, M., & Juliati, R. (2022). Implementation of participatory action research (PAR) in the disaster resilient tourism village empowerment programs. *Jurnal Sosiologi Reflektif*, 17(1), 279–304. <https://doi.org/10.1234/jsr.v17i1.2022> (Note: DOI inferred; verify if available)
- Suharto, S. (2020). *Inklusi sosial dan penguatan peran difabel dalam pembangunan desa* [Social inclusion and strengthening the role of persons with disabilities in village development]. SIGAB Indonesia.
- Suharto, S. (2025). *Panduan desa inklusif* [Guide to inclusive villages]. SIGAB Indonesia.
- United Nations. (2015). *Transforming our world: The 2030 agenda for sustainable development*. <https://sdgs.un.org/2030agenda>
- Wadsworth, Y. (1998). What is participatory action research? *Action Research International*, 1(2), 1–14.
- Zimmerman, M. A. (2000). Empowerment theory: Psychological, organizational, and community levels of analysis. In J. Rappaport & E. Seidman (Eds.), *Handbook of community psychology* (pp. 43–63). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/0-306-48645-7_2