Reformulating Public Participation Mechanisms In Legislative Processes: Towards A Deliberative And Responsive Model Of Democratic Lawmaking

Habibah Zulaiha
Universitas Islam Kadiri, Indonesia
Corresponding Author's : habibahzulaiha@uniska-kediri.ac.id

SEIKAT
Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Politik dan Hukum

e-ISSN: 2964-0962

SEIKAT: Jurnal Ilmu Sosial, Politik dan Hukum

https://ejournal.45mataram.ac.id/index.php/seikat

Vol. 5, No. 5, Oktober 2026

Page: 4556 - 4367

Available at:

https://ejournal.45mataram.ac.id/index.php/seikat/article/view/4557

DOI:

https://doi.org/10.55681/seikat.v5i5.4557

Article History:

Received: 01-10-2026
Revised: 30-10-2026
Accepted: 30-10-2026

Abstract *: Public participation has become a fundamental element of democratic lawmaking; however, many legislative systems continue to face challenges in transforming participation from procedural consultation into meaningful democratic engagement. This study aims to reformulate public participation mechanisms in legislative processes by developing a deliberative and responsive model of democratic lawmaking. Employing a qualitative socio-legal research approach, this study analyzes legislative frameworks, constitutional developments, academic literature, and contemporary debates on public participation through conceptual, statutory, and comparative approaches. The findings reveal three main issues: first, existing participation mechanisms have achieved formal legal recognition but remain predominantly procedural; second, current mechanisms lack deliberative quality, institutional responsiveness, and accountability in connecting public input with legislative outcomes; and third, effective democratic lawmaking requires an integrated framework combining deliberation, responsiveness, accountability, and inclusion. This study proposes the Deliberative-Responsive Public Participation Model, which conceptualizes public involvement as an institutional process consisting of meaningful dialogue, consideration of public input, transparent feedback mechanisms, and inclusive engagement. The research contributes theoretically by integrating deliberative democracy, responsive law, and meaningful participation perspectives into a comprehensive framework for legislative reform. Practically, the proposed model provides a foundation for strengthening participatory governance and improving the democratic legitimacy of legislative processes*

Keywords *: Public Participation; Deliberative Democracy; Responsive Law; Democratic Lawmaking*

Abstrak : Partisipasi publik telah menjadi elemen fundamental dalam pembentukan hukum yang demokratis; namun, banyak sistem legislatif masih menghadapi tantangan dalam mengubah partisipasi dari sekadar konsultasi prosedural menjadi keterlibatan demokratis yang bermakna. Studi ini bertujuan untuk merumuskan kembali mekanisme partisipasi publik dalam proses legislasi dengan mengembangkan model pembentukan hukum yang demokratis, deliberatif, dan responsif. Dengan menggunakan pendekatan penelitian sosio-legal kualitatif, studi ini menganalisis kerangka legislatif, perkembangan konstitusional, literatur akademis, serta perdebatan kontemporer mengenai partisipasi publik melalui pendekatan konseptual, perundang-undangan, dan komparatif. Temuan studi ini menunjukkan tiga masalah utama: pertama, mekanisme partisipasi yang ada saat ini telah mendapatkan pengakuan hukum secara formal, namun sifatnya masih sangat prosedural; kedua, mekanisme tersebut kurang memiliki kualitas deliberatif, responsivitas kelembagaan, dan akuntabilitas dalam menghubungkan masukan publik dengan hasil legislasi; dan ketiga, pembentukan hukum yang demokratis dan efektif memerlukan kerangka kerja terintegrasi yang menggabungkan deliberasi, responsivitas, akuntabilitas, dan inklusi. Studi ini mengusulkan "Model Partisipasi Publik yang Deliberatif-Responsif", yang mengonseptualisasikan keterlibatan publik sebagai proses kelembagaan yang mencakup dialog bermakna, pertimbangan terhadap masukan publik, mekanisme umpan balik yang transparan, serta keterlibatan yang inklusif. Secara teoretis, penelitian ini berkontribusi dengan mengintegrasikan perspektif demokrasi deliberatif, hukum responsif, dan partisipasi bermakna ke dalam kerangka kerja komprehensif untuk reformasi legislatif. Secara praktis, model yang diusulkan ini menyediakan landasan bagi penguatan tata kelola partisipatif dan peningkatan legitimasi demokratis dalam proses legislasi.

Kata Kunci: Partisipasi Publik; Demokrasi Deliberatif; Hukum Responsif; Pembentukan Hukum yang Demokratis

INTRODUCTION

The legitimacy of democratic governance is increasingly determined not only by the existence of representative institutions but also by the extent to which citizens are meaningfully involved in public decision-making processes. In contemporary democratic systems, lawmaking is no longer perceived merely as an institutional function performed by legislative bodies; rather, it represents a deliberative process in which public reasoning, social interests, and collective aspirations should be accommodated. The quality of legislation therefore depends not only on procedural compliance but also on the inclusiveness, transparency, and responsiveness of the mechanisms through which citizens participate in shaping legal norms. Within this context, public participation has become a fundamental element of democratic lawmaking and a critical indicator of legitimate governance (Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development [OECD], 2022).

Theoretically, democratic participation in legislative processes is closely associated with the concept of deliberative democracy, which emphasizes communication, rational discourse, and inclusive public engagement as sources of legal legitimacy. Habermas (1996) argues that democratic decisions achieve legitimacy when they emerge from processes of public deliberation where citizens are able to exchange arguments and influence collective decisions. Therefore, participation should not be reduced to a formal opportunity for submitting opinions but should function as a mechanism that enables meaningful interaction between the state and society. Similarly, the concept of responsive law developed by Nonet and Selznick (2001) highlights that legal institutions must remain sensitive to social realities and capable of responding to public needs. These theoretical perspectives demonstrate that democratic legislation requires a transformation from a merely procedural model of participation toward a deliberative and responsive framework.

However, despite the growing recognition of public participation as a democratic principle, many legislative systems continue to experience challenges in transforming participation from a symbolic procedure into substantive engagement. Arnstein's (1969) classical theory of the ladder of participation illustrates that not all forms of participation provide citizens with genuine influence over decision-making processes. Participation may exist only at a minimal level, such as consultation without obligation for policymakers to consider public input. This condition remains relevant in contemporary legislative practices, where public involvement is frequently provided through hearings, public consultations, or written submissions but does not necessarily affect the substance of legislation.

In Indonesia, the issue of public participation in legislative processes has become increasingly significant, particularly following the Constitutional Court Decision Number 91/PUU-XVIII/2020, which introduced the concept of meaningful participation as a constitutional requirement in lawmaking. The decision emphasized three fundamental dimensions of public involvement: the right to be heard, the right to have opinions considered, and the right to receive an explanation regarding the accommodation of public input. Nevertheless, the implementation of meaningful participation remains problematic because existing legislative mechanisms often emphasize procedural fulfillment rather than substantive deliberation (Prastyo, 2022). Consequently, a gap remains between constitutional recognition of participation rights and the practical mechanisms available for citizens to influence legislative outcomes.

Recent legislative experiences indicate that public participation mechanisms still face structural limitations. The debate surrounding the formation of the Job Creation Law demonstrated that formal opportunities for public involvement do not automatically guarantee meaningful engagement. Mochtar and Satriawan (2024) argue that participation mechanisms may become ineffective when public consultation is conducted merely as an administrative requirement rather than as a genuine deliberative process. Similarly, Wardana et al. (2023) found that Indonesian legislative participation mechanisms remain limited because they have not fully established institutional arrangements capable of integrating public perspectives into legislative decision-making. These findings suggest that the central challenge is not the absence of participation mechanisms, but rather the weakness of institutional designs that determine how participation is conducted, evaluated, and incorporated into legislative outcomes.

The urgency of reformulating public participation mechanisms is also strengthened by global developments in democratic governance. International organizations increasingly emphasize that effective citizen participation requires structured processes that ensure access to information, inclusive consultation, and continuous engagement between governments and citizens (OECD, 2022). Furthermore, technological developments have created new possibilities for digital participation, enabling broader public involvement in policymaking. However, digital participation alone cannot guarantee democratic quality unless supported by institutional mechanisms that ensure deliberation and responsiveness (Wafi & Izzi, 2024). Therefore, legislative reform requires not only expanding opportunities for participation but also redesigning the mechanisms through which public voices are processed and transformed into meaningful legislative considerations.

Several previous studies have examined the relationship between public participation and legislative processes. First, Prastyo (2022) analyzed the limitations of meaningful participation requirements in Indonesian lawmaking and highlighted the importance of implementing constitutional standards established by the Constitutional Court. Although the study provides significant legal analysis, it primarily focuses on normative interpretation and does not develop an

institutional model for improving participation mechanisms. Second, Wardana et al. (2023) examined public participation in Indonesian legislative processes and identified weaknesses in existing mechanisms. However, the study remains descriptive and does not sufficiently explore how deliberative democratic theory can be integrated into legislative institutional reform. Third, Wafi and Izzi (2024) investigated electronic participation as a means to optimize meaningful participation, contributing to discussions on digital legislative engagement. Nevertheless, their analysis focuses mainly on technological mechanisms and does not comprehensively address the broader relationship between deliberation, responsiveness, and democratic lawmaking.

Based on these previous studies, several limitations can be identified. Existing research has primarily concentrated on the legal recognition of participation rights, constitutional interpretation, or specific mechanisms such as digital participation. However, limited attention has been given to developing an integrated theoretical and institutional framework that combines deliberative democracy, responsive law, and meaningful participation principles into a comprehensive legislative participation model. This limitation represents an important research gap because democratic lawmaking requires more than procedural participation; it requires institutional arrangements capable of ensuring that public engagement contributes to the quality, legitimacy, and responsiveness of legislation.

This study seeks to address this gap by reformulating public participation mechanisms in legislative processes through the development of a deliberative and responsive model of democratic lawmaking. The novelty of this research lies in proposing an integrated framework that connects deliberative democratic principles, responsive legal theory, and meaningful participation standards into a conceptual model for improving legislative governance. Rather than viewing participation merely as a procedural obligation, this study conceptualizes public involvement as an institutional mechanism that enables dialogue, accountability, and responsiveness between citizens and legislative institutions.

Accordingly, this research aims to analyze the weaknesses of existing public participation mechanisms in legislative processes and to develop a deliberative and responsive model capable of strengthening democratic lawmaking. By combining theoretical perspectives and contemporary legislative challenges, this study contributes to the broader discussion on democratic governance, participatory lawmaking, and legal institutional reform.

METHODOLOGY

This study employs a qualitative socio-legal research design to examine and reformulate public participation mechanisms in legislative processes toward a deliberative and responsive model of democratic lawmaking. The socio-legal approach is used to analyze not only legal norms (law in books) but also their implementation within institutional and societal contexts (law in action). The study applies conceptual, statutory, comparative, and analytical approaches. The conceptual approach draws on deliberative democracy developed by Habermas (1996), responsive law proposed by Nonet and Selznick (2001), and participatory theory initiated by Arnstein (1969) to assess whether participation mechanisms facilitate meaningful involvement or merely fulfill procedural requirements. The statutory approach examines Law Number 12 of 2011 concerning the Formation of Laws and Regulations, as amended by Law Number 13 of 2022, and Constitutional Court Decision Number 91/PUU-XVIII/2020 concerning meaningful participation. The comparative approach considers international standards, particularly the OECD framework on citizen participation, and contemporary deliberative democratic practices. The analytical approach evaluates the relationship between formal participation procedures and substantive public influence, institutional accountability, and legislative responsiveness.

The study relies on secondary data comprising primary legal materials, secondary scholarly materials, and supporting institutional documents. Primary materials include legislation, constitutional court decisions, and official legislative documents; secondary materials include peer-reviewed articles, academic books, and studies on deliberative democracy, responsive law, participatory governance, and meaningful participation; while supporting materials include reports and policy documents, particularly from the OECD. Data are collected through documentary research and systematic literature review based on relevance, theoretical significance, and contribution to the research objectives. The data are analyzed using qualitative content analysis and legal interpretation through four stages: identifying existing participation mechanisms; critically evaluating their limitations against deliberative democracy, responsive law, and meaningful participation principles; synthesizing theoretical and institutional findings; and formulating the proposed model. The framework integrates deliberative democracy, responsive law, and meaningful participation to develop a more inclusive, accountable, and responsive model of democratic lawmaking that moves beyond procedural consultation toward substantive public influence on legislative processes.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Results

Existing Public Participation Framework: Legal Recognition and Procedural Implementation

The first finding shows that public participation is formally recognized as an essential element of democratic lawmaking in Indonesia, but its implementation remains predominantly procedural rather than substantive. Law Number 12 of 2011 concerning the Formation of Laws and Regulations, as amended by Law Number 13 of 2022, provides opportunities for public input, while Constitutional Court Decision Number 91/PUU-XVIII/2020 strengthened this framework through the principle of meaningful participation. This principle includes the right to be heard, the right to have opinions considered, and the right to receive an explanation regarding the treatment of public input (Prastyo, 2022). These requirements are consistent with the OECD (2022), which emphasizes information, consultation, and active engagement as essential components of effective citizen participation.

However, the analysis indicates a gap between formal participation rights and substantive influence on legislative outcomes. Public hearings, consultations, written submissions, and stakeholder discussions provide access to participation but do not consistently demonstrate how citizens' recommendations are evaluated or incorporated. Arnstein (1969) distinguishes such procedural involvement from participation that enables genuine influence over decision-making. Wardana et al. (2023) similarly identify institutional weaknesses in Indonesian lawmaking, while Mochtar and Satriawan (2024) demonstrate how participation may become a procedural formality, particularly in the controversy surrounding the Job Creation Law. From a deliberative perspective, meaningful participation requires argument exchange and mutual consideration rather than one-way consultation (Habermas, 1996; Bächtiger and Parkinson, 2021).

Table 1. Existing Framework of Public Participation in Legislative Processes

Aspect	Existing Condition	Main Limitation
Legal recognition	Participation is formally guaranteed through legislation and constitutional interpretation	Normative recognition does not ensure substantive influence

Participation channels	Hearings, consultations, written submissions, and stakeholder discussions	Often function as one-way or consultation-based mechanisms
Public influence	Citizens can submit opinions and recommendations	Limited transparency regarding their incorporation into legislation
Feedback	Meaningful participation recognizes the right to explanation	Systematic feedback on accepted, modified, or rejected input remains limited
Democratic function	Participation supports legislative legitimacy	Deliberation and institutional responsiveness remain insufficient

Weaknesses of Existing Participation Mechanisms

The second finding identifies three interconnected weaknesses: limited deliberative quality, weak institutional responsiveness and accountability, and unequal inclusiveness. Existing mechanisms tend to collect public preferences rather than facilitate structured argumentation and reciprocal reasoning. From the perspective of deliberative democracy, this creates a gap between participation as access and participation as influence (Habermas, 1996). The problem is reinforced by the limited institutional obligation to explain how public recommendations are processed. Although meaningful participation requires citizens to know whether their views are considered, accepted, modified, or rejected, such feedback mechanisms remain insufficiently institutionalized (Prastyo, 2022). This condition is inconsistent with responsive law, which requires legal institutions to remain connected to social needs and respond to societal demands (Nonet and Selznick, 2001).

A further weakness concerns inclusion. Formal access does not guarantee equal participation because groups differ in political resources, legal knowledge, institutional networks, economic capacity, and technological access. The OECD (2022) emphasizes that effective participation requires accessibility, inclusiveness, and representation of diverse perspectives. Digital participation may broaden access, but it cannot independently resolve institutional weaknesses; Wafi and Izzi (2024) emphasize that electronic participation requires institutional mechanisms ensuring that digital input receives meaningful consideration. Consequently, public participation should also be understood as a source of institutional learning that can improve regulatory quality by incorporating social knowledge into legislative evaluation (Suhendarto and Handoyo, 2025).

Table 2. Key Weaknesses of Existing Public Participation Mechanisms

Weakness	Manifestation	Democratic Consequence
Deliberative deficit	Consultation dominates over dialogue and argument exchange	Limited substantive public influence
Weak responsiveness	Public input is received without systematic institutional response	Weak connection between participation and legislation
Accountability gap	Limited explanation of how recommendations are treated	Citizens cannot adequately assess institutional responsiveness
Limited inclusion	Unequal capacity to access and influence legislative processes	Participation may favor resource-rich groups
Digital limitation	Digital channels expand access but do not guarantee influence	Procedural weaknesses may be reproduced digitally

Reformulation Toward a Deliberative and Responsive Participation Model

The third finding identifies four essential dimensions for reformulating public participation: deliberation, responsiveness, accountability and transparency, and inclusion. First, deliberation requires structured dialogue, argument exchange, adequate information, and opportunities for citizens to contribute to legislative reasoning (Habermas, 1996; Bächtiger and Parkinson, 2021). Second, responsiveness requires legislative institutions to systematically receive, evaluate, and respond to public input. In accordance with responsive law, participation should function as a source of legal development rather than merely a procedural obligation (Nonet and Selznick, 2001). Third, accountability and transparency require documentation of public input and explanations concerning whether recommendations are accepted, modified, or rejected, reflecting the principles of meaningful participation and the OECD (2022). Fourth, inclusion requires institutional arrangements that enable diverse and marginalized groups to participate effectively.

Based on the synthesis of these findings, this study proposes the Deliberative and Responsive Public Participation Model for Democratic Lawmaking. The model moves beyond the question of whether participation opportunities exist toward the institutional conditions necessary for participation to generate meaningful democratic effects. Digital participation is positioned as an enabling instrument within this framework rather than as a substitute for institutional reform (Wafi and Izzi, 2024). The resulting model integrates deliberative democracy, responsive law, and meaningful participation into a coherent institutional framework for strengthening democratic legitimacy and legislative responsiveness.

Table 3. Key Dimensions of the Deliberative and Responsive Public Participation Model

Dimension	Core Principle	Institutional Mechanism	Expected Function
Deliberation	Dialogue and reason-giving	Interactive forums, information sharing, argument exchange	Strengthen public reasoning
Responsiveness	Institutional response to social input	Systematic review and consideration of recommendations	Connect participation with legislative decisions
Accountability & Transparency	Explainability of decisions	Documentation and feedback on public input	Enable public monitoring
Inclusion	Equal opportunity for diverse groups	Accessible channels and representation mechanisms	Broaden substantive participation
Digital participation	Technology as an enabling instrument	Online consultation and interaction platforms	Expand access and continuity of engagement

The results demonstrate a transition from procedural participation toward deliberative, responsive, accountable, and inclusive lawmaking. The proposed model therefore positions public participation not merely as an opportunity to express opinions but as an institutional process through which citizens contribute to legislative reasoning, evaluation, and the development of legal norms.

Discussion

From Procedural Participation to Deliberative Democratic Lawmaking: A Habermasian Perspective

The findings of this study demonstrate that the central challenge of public participation in legislative processes lies not primarily in the availability of participatory mechanisms but in the limited transformation of participation from procedural involvement into meaningful democratic deliberation. Participation should therefore not be evaluated merely by the existence of formal opportunities for citizens to provide input, but by whether these opportunities enable citizens to engage in reasoning, dialogue, and influence over legislative decisions. This finding reinforces Habermas's (1996) theory of deliberative democracy, which emphasizes that legitimate lawmaking requires communicative processes through which citizens participate in the formation of public reasoning. Democratic legitimacy is thus derived not exclusively from representative institutions but also from the quality of discourse through which collective decisions are justified. The findings indicate that existing legislative participation mechanisms frequently remain within a procedural paradigm: citizens are provided with channels to express opinions, but these channels often lack institutional structures for continuous dialogue between lawmakers and society. Consequently, participation tends to become a momentary interaction rather than an ongoing process of collective reasoning, limiting the communicative conditions necessary for democratic legitimacy.

This finding implies that legislative institutions need to reconsider the purpose and function of public participation. Participation should not merely serve as a mechanism for collecting public preferences but should contribute to better legal decisions through the exchange of knowledge, arguments, social experiences, and practical perspectives. In this regard, the present study extends previous discussions of meaningful participation in Indonesia. Prastyo (2022) emphasizes that the meaningful participation principle introduced by the Constitutional Court requires citizens to be heard, have their opinions considered, and receive information regarding the treatment of their input. The present study extends this framework by demonstrating that these three elements require a deeper deliberative foundation; without institutional structures that facilitate dialogue and reasoning, meaningful participation may remain primarily procedural rather than producing substantive democratic effects. This interpretation is consistent with Bächtiger and Parkinson (2021), who argue that deliberation involves more than discussion, as it requires participants to exchange reasons and have opportunities to influence collective decisions. Accordingly, legislative participation mechanisms should be assessed according to their capacity to generate meaningful interaction between citizens and legislative actors and to incorporate public reasoning into legislative consideration.

The shift from procedural toward deliberative participation also has implications for the relationship between representation and citizen engagement. A deliberative model does not seek to replace representative institutions or transfer legislative authority from elected bodies to citizens; rather, it complements representative democracy by strengthening the relationship between public reasoning and institutional decision-making. Under this approach, citizens contribute not only preferences but also knowledge and arguments that can inform legislative judgment, while legislative institutions remain responsible for making legally authorized decisions. Such a model can address the disconnect between public involvement and legislative outcomes identified in this study. When participation is limited to the submission of opinions, public involvement remains separated from subsequent decision-making; by contrast, deliberative participation requires institutional mechanisms that connect public reasoning with legislative consideration. This perspective is particularly relevant to contemporary democratic governance, where transparency and responsiveness are important dimensions of institutional legitimacy. The OECD (2022) emphasizes that effective citizen participation strengthens democratic governance when citizens perceive that their involvement has meaningful consequences. Deliberative participation can

therefore function not only as a democratic principle but also as an institutional mechanism for strengthening the connection between public engagement, legislative reasoning, and institutional legitimacy.

The theoretical implication of these findings is that democratic lawmaking requires a transformation from an input-based model of participation toward a deliberation-based model. Input-based participation primarily concerns whether citizens are allowed to provide opinions, whereas deliberation-based participation concerns whether those opinions enter a meaningful process of evaluation, justification, and collective reasoning. The latter provides a stronger institutional basis for connecting citizen participation with the justification of legal decisions. Accordingly, this study proposes a conceptual shift from viewing citizens as external contributors to recognizing them as participants in the democratic production of law. This shift constitutes a theoretical contribution by integrating deliberative democracy principles into the institutional design of legislative participation mechanisms and by positioning public participation as an ongoing communicative process through which citizens and legislative institutions interact in the development of legitimate and responsive laws.

Reconstructing Legislative Responsiveness Through Responsive Law Theory

The second dimension of this discussion concerns the reconstruction of legislative responsiveness through responsive law theory. The findings demonstrate that the weaknesses of existing public participation mechanisms involve not only limited deliberative spaces but also the inability of legislative institutions to systematically process, evaluate, and respond to public input. Participation becomes meaningful when institutions possess the capacity and institutional obligation to translate societal concerns into legislative consideration. Nonet and Selznick (2001) developed responsive law as a critique of legal systems that prioritize formal legality while neglecting social realities. From this perspective, law is not an autonomous instrument separated from society but must continuously interact with social conditions, public expectations, and evolving societal values. Applied to legislative processes, responsive law requires mechanisms through which social perspectives can meaningfully contribute to the development of legal norms. The findings indicate that existing mechanisms have not fully achieved this condition because citizens may submit opinions without sufficient institutional responsibility to demonstrate how those opinions are considered or incorporated into legislative decisions. Participation without responsiveness therefore risks becoming symbolic, serving to legitimize predetermined decisions rather than improving the quality and legitimacy of legislation.

This study further extends the concept of meaningful participation by positioning it not only as a procedural right but also as an institutional obligation. The three elements established through Constitutional Court Decision Number 91/PUU-XVIII/2020—the right to be heard, the right to have opinions considered, and the right to receive an explanation—imply corresponding responsibilities for legislative institutions to establish transparent and responsive processes. In this regard, the study advances the findings of Wardana et al. (2023), who identified institutional weaknesses in Indonesian legislative participation mechanisms, by arguing that the fundamental issue concerns the absence of a sufficiently responsive institutional framework. The issue is therefore not merely whether participation exists, but whether institutions can transform public input into responsive decision-making. Responsive legislation also depends on access to social knowledge that cannot be fully obtained through institutional analysis alone because laws reflect social choices, values, priorities, and the experiences of affected communities. Accordingly, responsive legislative governance requires at least three institutional mechanisms: systematic evaluation and categorization of public recommendations; feedback procedures explaining

whether input is accepted, modified, or rejected; and accountability mechanisms enabling citizens to monitor the relationship between participation and legislative outcomes.

These transformations represent a shift from a closed legislative model toward an open and responsive model in which public participation is integrated into the core stages of lawmaking rather than treated as a supplementary activity. The OECD (2022) emphasizes that citizen participation contributes to democratic resilience when institutions establish clear engagement processes and demonstrate how public contributions influence decisions. Responsiveness is therefore central to determining whether participation strengthens institutional legitimacy and public trust. This principle also applies to digital participation: although digital platforms can expand citizen involvement, technological accessibility alone cannot guarantee responsive governance. Wafi and Izzi (2024) demonstrate that electronic participation can support meaningful participation only when institutions establish mechanisms ensuring that digital contributions are incorporated into legislative processes. Responsive law consequently positions participation as a form of institutional learning through which lawmakers can identify regulatory problems, anticipate social impacts, and improve the effectiveness of legal implementation. Citizens should therefore not be viewed merely as information providers, nor lawmakers solely as recipients of input, but as participants within a responsive institutional relationship in which public engagement contributes to continuous improvement of legislative outcomes.

The theoretical contribution of this study lies in extending responsive law theory into the institutional design of legislative participation. While Nonet and Selznick (2001) developed responsive law as a general theory of legal institutions, this research applies its principles specifically to the processes through which legal norms are produced. In this framework, responsiveness should characterize not only the substance or outcomes of legislation but also the institutional processes through which those outcomes are developed. The study therefore proposes a transition from participatory access toward institutional responsiveness, in which democratic participation depends on the capacity of legislative institutions to listen, consider, explain, and adapt in response to public contributions. This perspective complements the deliberative dimension identified previously by establishing the institutional conditions necessary for public reasoning to influence legislative decision-making. Consequently, responsive law becomes not merely a theory concerning how legal institutions respond to society but also a framework for designing participation mechanisms that connect citizen input with legislative reasoning and outcomes.

Theoretical and Practical Contributions of the Proposed Model

The development of the Deliberative-Responsive Public Participation Model generates theoretical and practical contributions by integrating deliberative democracy, responsive law, and meaningful participation into a unified framework for legislative governance. Theoretically, the model extends deliberative democracy by emphasizing that public reasoning requires institutional mechanisms connecting dialogue with decision-making; it expands responsive law by positioning responsiveness within the process of law production rather than only in legal outcomes; and it operationalizes meaningful participation by translating abstract participation rights into institutional dimensions of access, deliberation, response, accountability, and inclusion. Practically, the model provides a framework for legislative institutions to strengthen democratic legitimacy through institutional reform rather than merely expanding consultation opportunities. It calls for clearer procedures for receiving, evaluating, responding to, and documenting public input, thereby connecting participation directly with legislative reasoning and outcomes. Ultimately, the model repositions public participation from a supplementary procedural requirement to an integral component of democratic lawmaking and provides an institutional framework for developing

legislation that is legally valid, democratically legitimate, socially responsive, and institutionally accountable.

CONCLUSION

This study demonstrates that although public participation has gained formal recognition in legislative processes, its implementation remains predominantly procedural, with limited mechanisms ensuring that public input is deliberated, considered, and connected to legislative outcomes. Three main findings were identified: first, existing mechanisms emphasize access to participation rather than substantive influence; second, they remain constrained by limited deliberative quality, institutional responsiveness, and accountability; and third, effective democratic lawmaking requires an integrated framework combining deliberation, responsiveness, accountability, and inclusion. Accordingly, this study proposes the Deliberative-Responsive Public Participation Model, comprising four interconnected dimensions: deliberative engagement, institutional responsiveness, accountability and transparency, and inclusive participation. Theoretically, the model integrates Habermas's deliberative democracy, Nonet and Selznick's responsive law, and contemporary concepts of meaningful participation into a framework for legislative institutional reform, positioning public participation as an essential mechanism for producing legitimate and responsive legal norms. Practically, the model highlights the need for mechanisms such as systematic consideration of public input, transparent legislative responses, inclusive representation, and institutionalized digital participation. Nevertheless, as a qualitative socio-legal study, this research primarily examines conceptual and institutional dimensions; future studies should empirically test the model across legislative contexts and democratic systems. Overall, meaningful participation requires a shift from procedural consultation toward deliberative, responsive, accountable, and inclusive democratic lawmaking..

REFERENCES

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

Bächtiger, A., Dryzek, J. S., Mansbridge, J., & Warren, M. E. (2018). *The Oxford handbook of deliberative democracy*. Oxford University Press.

Bächtiger, A., & Parkinson, J. (2021). *Mapping and measuring deliberation: Towards a new deliberative quality*. Oxford University Press.

Dryzek, J. S. (2000). *Deliberative democracy and beyond: Liberals, critics, contestations*. Oxford University Press.

Fawazi, L. M. A., Prasetyo, N., & Susmayanti, R. (2026). The ideal regulation of meaningful public participation in the legislative process by the House of Representatives. *Yurisdiksi: Jurnal Wacana Hukum dan Sains, 22*(3), 1–18.

Fung, A. (2006). Varieties of participation in complex governance. *Public Administration Review, 66*(s1), 66–75. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-6210.2006.00667.x

Fung, A. (2015). Putting the public back into governance: The challenges of citizen participation and its future. *Public Administration Review, 75*(4), 513–522. https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12361

Habermas, J. (1996). *Between facts and norms: Contributions to a discourse theory of law and democracy*. MIT Press.

Hanum, W. N. (2026). Testing the implementation of meaningful participation as an operational concept in lawmaking: Indonesia's extractive regulations case. *Journal of Public Policy and Environmental Law.*

Mochtar, Z. A., & Satriawan, I. (2024). From meaningful to meaningless participation: The tragedy of Indonesia's Omnibus Law on Job Creation. *Jurnal Media Hukum, 31*(2), 165–182.

Nabatchi, T., & Leighninger, M. (2015). *Public participation for 21st century democracy*. Jossey-Bass.

Nonet, P., & Selznick, P. (2001). *Law and society in transition: Toward responsive law*. Transaction Publishers.

Nursetiawan, E., & Ardhanariswari, R. (2023). Meaningful participation in legislative drafting as a manifestation of a democratic rule of law. *Jambe Law Journal, 5*(2), 155–176.

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2021). *Government at a glance 2021*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/1c258f55-en

Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. (2022). *OECD guidelines for citizen participation processes*. OECD Publishing. https://doi.org/10.1787/f765caf6-en

Pateman, C. (1970). *Participation and democratic theory*. Cambridge University Press.

Prastyo, A. (2022). Limitation of meaningful participation requirements in the Indonesian law-making process. *Jurnal Hukum dan Peradilan, 11*(3), 425–444.

Putra, R. K., et al. (2026). Urgency of meaningful participation in law-making processes in the digital media era. *Indonesian Journal of Law and Society.*

Sa'adati, & Yopan, M. (2026). The implementation of meaningful participation in lawmaking: A comparative study and its implications for Indonesia. *Locus Journal of Academic Literature Review.*

Setälä, M. (2022). Connecting deliberative mini-publics to representative decision making. *European Journal of Political Research, 61*(1), 17–35.

Suhendarto, B. P., & Handoyo, B. (2025). Meaningful participation and regulatory impact analysis in legislation from the perspective of Habermas' deliberative democracy. *Refleksi Hukum: Jurnal Ilmu Hukum, 9*(2), 245–264.

Wafi, M. A., & Izzi, M. M. B. (2024). Integrating electronic participation in the legislative process to optimize the fulfillment of meaningful participation. *Jurnal Konstitusi, 21*(2), 215–234.

Wardana, D. J., Sukardi, & Salman, R. (2023). Public participation in the law-making process in Indonesia. *Jurnal Media Hukum, 30*(1), 1–15.

Wardana, D. J. (2025). Model ideal partisipasi masyarakat yang responsif dalam pembentukan undang-undang. *Jurnal Legislasi Indonesia, 22*(4), 455–470.