



The role of child forums in promoting child well-being: A social welfare perspective on participation and geographic equity

Nurul Ramadhani^{1,*}

¹ Department of Social Development and Welfare, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Sleman, Special Region of Yogyakarta 55281, Indonesia.

*Correspondence: nurulramadhanii09@gmail.com

Received Date: January 20, 2026

Revised Date: June 15, 2026

Accepted Date: July 20, 2026

ABSTRACT

Background: Indonesia institutionalizes children's participation through Children's Forum as part of the *Kabupaten/Kota Layak Anak* (Child-Friendly Regency/City, KLA) policy, similar to how many cities around the world give children a formal voice in local governance. Prior Indonesian studies document Children's Forum's formal existence and its dependence on local government partnership, but district-level studies outside major cities remain limited, particularly on how geography shapes equitable access to participation, an issue also highlighted in broader research on children's civic participation. **Methods:** This qualitative descriptive study draws on undergraduate thesis fieldwork conducted in Gowa Regency, South Sulawesi, in December 2020. Data were collected through semi-structured interviews with six informants (a DP3A official and five Children's Forum leaders/members), participatory observation, and documentation study, and analyzed following standard stages of qualitative data condensation, display, and conclusion drawing. **Findings:** Children's Forum Gowa performs four roles: strengthening children's participation rights (chiefly via *Musrenbang Anak*, which Gowa pioneered in South Sulawesi in 2017), providing space for freedom of expression, supporting equitable access to education, and focusing advocacy on priority child issues (child marriage, bullying, and stunting). These roles are constrained by three recurring challenges: limited outreach to highland sub-districts, limited and inconsistent funding, and uneven cooperation from some local governments. Read through a social welfare perspective and a ladder-of-participation framework, the forum generates empowerment and social capital, but its benefits appear concentrated in lowland, more accessible sub-districts. **Conclusion:** Children's Forum Gowa is a meaningful, government-recognized channel for child participation, but its equitable reach depends on resolving practical funding and geographic-access constraints. **Novelty/Originality of this article:** This study contributes a district-level account from South Sulawesi's highland-lowland terrain, showing how a regency-pioneered participation mechanism (*Musrenbang Anak*) can still reproduce geographic inequity even where the formal institutional design is comparatively advanced.

KEYWORDS: child participation; child-friendly regency (KLA); Children's Forum; Gowa Regency; social welfare.

1. Introduction

Children's well-being occupies a central place in global and national development agendas. The 1989 Convention on the Rights of the Child (CRC) establishes participation as one of its four foundational principles, obliging states to give due weight to children's views in matters affecting them (United Nations, 1989). Two influential frameworks have since

Cite This Article:

Ramadhani, N. (2026). The role of child forums in promoting child well-being: A social welfare perspective on participation and geographic equity. *Journal of Gender Equality Disability Social Inclusion and Children*, 4(1), 62-79. <https://doi.org/10.61511/jgedsic.v4i1.2026.3265>

Copyright: © 2026 by the author. This article is distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>).



shaped how this principle is operationalized and evaluated. Arnstein's (1969) Ladder of Citizen Participation, developed originally for adult community planning, distinguishes degrees of citizen power from manipulation to citizen control. Hart (1992) adapted this idea specifically for children, proposing an eight-rung Ladder of Participation running from manipulation and tokenism at the bottom to child-initiated, shared decisions with adults at the top. Building on this, Shier (2001) reframed participation as a series of "pathways"—openings, opportunities, and obligations that organizations must actively build rather than assume. Lundy (2007) further argued that meaningful implementation of CRC Article 12 requires attention to four elements: space, voice, audience, and influence, cautioning that children can be heard without their views having any real bearing on outcomes.

In Indonesia, this international normative architecture has been translated into the Child-Friendly Regency/City (KLA—*Kabupaten/Kota Layak Anak*) policy, coordinated by the Ministry of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection/*Kementerian Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak (Kemen PPPA)*. Regencies and cities are evaluated across clusters of child-rights indicators, one of which is the existence and functioning of Children's Forum, a child-led forum established from village to national level, formalized through Regulation of the Minister of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection of the Republic of Indonesia No. 18 of 2019 on the Implementation of Children's Forums. Children's Forum is intended to give children a structured channel through which to raise concerns, and its presence is itself one of the indicators used in KLA evaluation (Kementerian PPPA, 2023).

A growing body of international research has examined how child-participation forums function in specific municipalities and regions. Riadigos & Gradaille (2023), studying the Forum for the Participation of Children and Teenagers in Teo, Spain, found that such municipal forums are perceived by children themselves as a genuine right, but that their benefits are constrained by adult-centric decision-making, a strong dependence on adults for logistics, and limited spaces for participation in outlying parts of the municipality, constraints that closely parallel those documented for Children's Forum Gowa in Section 3.3. Setyamandani & Firdausi (2023) demonstrated, through the case of Probolinggo Regency in Indonesia, that a district's ability to achieve KLA status is closely tied to whether it has a supporting regional regulation (*Peraturan Daerah*); districts without such a legal umbrella struggle to sustain the required programs. At the more resourced end of the spectrum, Hastira et al. (2024) found that Surabaya City's Child-Friendly Cities Initiative (CFCI), developed in cooperation with UNICEF, has enabled the fulfillment of children's participation rights to a standard consistent with both Ladder & Lundy's participation model, contributing to Surabaya's recognition at the Utama/national KLA level.

Indonesia isn't the only country dealing with this imbalance. In a mixed-methods study of civic learning across primary schools in England, Body et al. (2024) found that children from wealthier backgrounds are systematically more likely to be prepared for active civic participation oriented around social justice than children from disadvantaged backgrounds—a socio-economic disparity conceptually parallel to the geographic (highland-lowland) disparity this study investigates in Gowa. Similarly, in a participatory action research project conducted across three schools in Umbumbulu, South Africa, Padayachee et al. (2023) found that community-based participatory approaches could shape children's civic values, but that intended change was not always fully achieved, underscoring that even well-designed participatory interventions face implementation gaps in under-resourced settings—a pattern also evident in Children's Forum Gowa's highland-outreach difficulties. In a comparable Southeast Asian context, Saguil (2021) found that early-childhood participation practices in the Philippines varied considerably across settings depending on how well local staff understood the prerequisites for genuine participation, again suggesting that formal participation policy does not automatically translate into uniform practice on the ground.

At the national level, UNICEF Indonesia's situational analysis (Octarra et al., 2022) found that awareness of formal child-participation platforms such as Musrenbang and Children's Forum remains uneven: a substantial share of adolescents surveyed had never heard of these mechanisms, and non-participation was frequently attributed not to

disinterest but to not knowing how to participate or never being invited. This pattern echoes a broader international concern: a recent systematic review of citizen participation in childhood education (Alamo-Bolanos et al., 2024) similarly concluded that socio-economic inequalities and uneven access remain among the most persistent barriers to genuine child participation across the studies it reviewed, even where formal educational and civic structures exist. This raises the question of whether, and how, participation opportunities are distributed unevenly even within a single regency, a question that existing regency-level case studies (Setyamandani & Firdausi, 2023; Hastira et al., 2024) have not directly examined, since they concentrate on the forum's relationship with local government rather than on internal, sub-district-level disparities in access.

Gowa Regency in South Sulawesi presents a useful case for this question because it combines two features rarely studied together: an institutionally advanced participation mechanism. Gowa is documented as the first regency in South Sulawesi to hold a Musrenbang Anak, beginning in 2017, and a physically diverse territory spanning dense lowland sub-districts around Sungguminasa and Somba Opu, and sparser highland sub-districts such as Malino and Tinggimoncong. This combination allows the present study to ask not only whether Children's Forum functions, but whether its functioning is equitably distributed across a regency's geography.

These frameworks matter beyond the specific case of Children's Forum because children's participation is increasingly recognized as instrumental, not only intrinsic, to broader development outcomes. The Sustainable Development Goals link inclusive, participatory institutions (Goal 16) to the achievement of health and well-being outcomes (Goal 3), on the premise that decisions made without the input of those affected are less likely to address their actual needs (United Nations, 1989). The OECD (2023) similarly frames child and youth participation in decision-making as a contributor to more cohesive and resilient societies, while cautioning that simply giving children a "voice" does not by itself predict improved well-being unless that voice is genuinely acted upon—a distinction closely related to Lundy's (2007) separation of "voice" from "influence." In Indonesia's decentralized governance system, this premise carries particular weight: because authority over education, health, and social-welfare programming is distributed across more than 500 regencies and cities, the quality of a child's participation opportunities depends heavily on decisions made at the district level, not only on national policy design. A well-drafted national regulation such as Ministerial Regulation No. 18/2019 on Children's Forum sets a floor, but whether that floor translates into a genuinely functioning forum with adequate budget, transportation, and follow-through on children's proposals depends on regency-level implementation capacity and political will (Setyamandani & Firdausi, 2023).

With power spread out like this, national- or provincial-level averages can obscure substantial within-regency variation. A regency may be formally recognized as child-friendly while some of its sub-districts remain effectively outside the reach of its flagship participation programs. Cuevas-Parra (2024) makes a related argument at the global level, observing that children's participation is increasingly shaped by intersecting economic, geographic, and social inequalities that determine who within a population of children actually gets to participate, even where participation rights are formally guaranteed for all. This possibility is underexplored in the existing Children's Forum literature, which has generally treated a regency as a single unit of analysis defined primarily by its relationship to provincial or national government (Hastira et al., 2024), rather than examining internal geographic variation. Gowa's combination of dense lowland sub-districts and remote highland sub-districts makes it a useful setting in which to surface this within-regency dimension, complementing the between-regency comparisons that dominate the current literature.

Methodologically, this study also responds to a gap noted by Freire et al. (2022) in their systematic review of participatory methods with children and adolescents, which found that most published studies describe participatory methods in single, relatively homogeneous settings and rarely examine how the same method performs differently across sub-populations within one setting. Blanco et al. (2022), in a scoping review of child-led

participation studies, similarly found that most empirical work on children's participation is concentrated in urban or otherwise well-resourced settings, with rural and geographically marginal contexts comparatively under-studied a gap this study addresses directly through its focus on Gowa's highland sub-districts.

As a follow-up to my undergraduate fieldwork in Gowa back in December 2020 (Ramadhani, 2021), this study explores two key questions: (1) What role does Children's Forum Gowa play in promoting child well-being within the local KLA policy framework? and (2) What challenges does Children's Forum Gowa face in carrying out this role? These questions are examined through Midgley's (1995) Social Welfare Approach, which frames well-being as encompassing empowerment and participation alongside material welfare, and through Hart's (1992) Ladder of Participation as an interpretive lens for assessing the quality and distribution of children's involvement. Following Hart's (2008) advice not to treat the Ladder as a rigid checklist but as a flexible framework, this study treats rung placement as interpretive rather than as a precise, measured score. The study's contribution is to document, at district level, how a comparatively advanced participation mechanism can still reproduce geographic inequity, an angle that complements the institution-focused findings of prior Indonesian Children's Forum research and speaks to the broader international literature on inequality in children's participation (Body et al., 2024; Cuevas-Parra, 2024).

2. Methods

2.1 Research approach

This study used a qualitative descriptive approach, combining a social welfare perspective with a sociological perspective, to describe the roles and operational dynamics of Children's Forum Gowa within the regency's KLA policy framework. The approach follows the broader tradition of qualitative case-study research on local child-participation institutions used in comparable studies internationally (Riadigos & Gradaille, 2023) and in Indonesia (Setyamandani & Firdausi, 2023), which likewise combine interviews, observation, and document analysis to characterize a single locality's implementation of child-protection policy.

2.2 Research location

The research was conducted in Gowa Regency, South Sulawesi, focusing on Children's Forum Kabupaten Gowa under the coordination of the *Dinas Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak* (DP3A) Kabupaten Gowa. Gowa covers 1,883.33 km² across 18 sub-districts (*kecamatan*), ranging from lowland areas near the provincial capital Makassar to highland areas at elevations up to roughly 2,800 meters above sea level, including Malino and Tinggimoncong (BPS Gowa, 2020). This topographic range motivated the location choice, since it allows the study to examine whether Children's Forum's reach varies with physical accessibility. This study is guided by an interpretivist perspective, a choice that aligns with its goal of understanding how Children's Forum's roles and constraints are experienced and described by the people directly involved in running it, rather than measuring predefined variables; this is why a qualitative, informant-centered design was chosen over a survey-based approach, consistent with the approach taken in comparable international and Indonesian child-participation case studies (Riadigos & Gradaille, 2023; Setyamandani & Firdausi, 2023). December 2020 was selected as the fieldwork period because it coincided with the end of the 2020 Children's Forum leadership term and the transition to the 2020–2021 leadership, allowing the study to interview outgoing and incoming leadership in close succession.

2.3 Data sources and collection

Primary data were collected through semi-structured interviews and participatory observation conducted in Gowa during December 2020. Informants were selected purposively and comprised: the Kepala Sub Bidang Pemenuhan Hak Anak, DP3A Kabupaten Gowa; the *Chairperson* and Wakil *Chairperson* of Children's Forum Gowa (spanning the 2018–2019 and 2020–2021 leadership periods); and members of Children's Forum Gowa, including a Duta Anak. This mix was intentionally chosen to triangulate the data and ensure a well-rounded government perspective (DP3A), the organizational-leadership perspective (*Chairperson*/Wakil *Chairperson* across two periods), and the rank-and-file member perspective. Table 0 lists the six informants.

Table 1. Informant profile

Informant	Role / Position	Interview date
HH	Head of the Child Rights Fulfillment Subdivision, Office of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection (DP3A), Gowa Regency	December 28, 2020
MAT (18)	Chairperson of the Gowa Children's Forum, 2018–2019	December 23, 2020
SW (17)	Chairperson of the Gowa Children's Forum, 2020–2021	December 25, 2020
AA (16)	Vice Chairperson of the Gowa Children's Forum, 2020	December 25, 2020
AM (17)	Member of the Gowa Children's Forum	December 27, 2020
Child Ambassador of Gowa Regency (2019 Selection)	Member of the Gowa Children's Forum; Child Ambassador	December, 2020

Interviewing two successive *Chairpersons of the Children's Forum* (2018–2019 and 2020–2021) was a deliberate design choice, intended to check whether the roles and challenges reported were specific to one leadership period or persisted across periods; as reported in Sections 3.2 and 3.3, several findings, notably the highland-outreach challenge, were corroborated independently by both leaders. Secondary data were drawn from Children's Forum Gowa's internal documentation (activity photographs and records), the Ministerial Regulation on Children's Forum, and Gowa Regency Regional Regulation No. 5 of 2014 on child protection.

2.4 Data analysis

Data were analyzed through the stages of data condensation, data display, and conclusion drawing/verification (Miles et al., 2019). Interview transcripts were coded manually into the four role-related and three challenge-related themes reported in Section 3, with findings cross-checked across the accounts of DP3A officials, Children's Forum leadership, and Children's Forum members to support the credibility of the analysis. Where informants across roles converged on the same description of an activity or constraint (for example, the highland-outreach difficulty, corroborated independently by two successive Children's Forum leaders), this convergence is treated as a marker of data trustworthiness. The primary field data underlying this study were collected in December 2020, and the underlying thesis was completed in June 2021. The regency-level KLA achievement record in Table 1 reflects thesis documentation up to 2020. Readers are encouraged to verify Gowa Regency's current Child-Friendly Regency/City (KLA) classification directly with the Gowa Regency Office of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection (DP3A) or the Ministry of Women's Empowerment and Child Protection (MoWECP), as public reports published after the original fieldwork have, at times, assigned the regency a different KLA category.

3. Results and Discussion

3.1 Institutional background

The Gowa Children's Forum was established in 2011 under the leadership of Nurul Zakinah, who also represented South Sulawesi at the Indonesian Children's Congress (*Kongres Anak Indonesia*) in Solo. It was established to provide children in Gowa Regency with a formal platform to express their views and participate in addressing issues affecting children at the local level. The forum was subsequently institutionalized through Gowa Regency Regional Regulation No. 5 of 2014 on Child Protection, while its membership is renewed for each term through a Regent's Decree. This regulatory framework provides Gowa with a relatively stronger institutional basis for implementing child participation initiatives than some other regencies. For example, Setyamandani & Firdausi (2023) reported that Probolinggo Regency had not yet enacted a specific regional regulation supporting the Child-Friendly Regency/City (KLA) program.

The forum organizes its work into five clusters aligned with the CRC: (1) civil rights and freedoms, (2) family environment and alternative care, (3) basic health and welfare, (4) education, leisure, and cultural activities, and (5) special protection. Each cluster corresponds to a set of CRC articles and is used, as described in Section 3.2.1, as the organizing structure for Musrenbang Anak discussion groups, so that children's proposals can be mapped directly onto the government's own rights-based reporting categories for KLA evaluation. One key reason for this cluster structure is to allow Children's Forum Gowa's internal organization to easily collaborate with the formal KLA evaluation apparatus administered by Kemen PPPA (2023), rather than functioning as a purely informal youth club.

Table 2 summarizes documented achievements between 2016 and 2020, including national and provincial recognitions. The 2017 Dafa Award recognition is notable in that it was awarded at the national level for the forum's activity quality, a year before Gowa's first KLA recognition, suggesting that, in Gowa's case, the forum's own organizational development preceded, and plausibly contributed to, the regency's broader KLA achievement, rather than being a byproduct of it.

Table 2. Documented Children's Forum Gowa / KLA achievements, 2016–2020

Year	Achievement	Source
2016	Second-best Children's Forum at South Sulawesi provincial level; 1st place in the children's exhibition category	Ramadhani (2021)
2017	National Best Children's Forum, Madya level (Dafa Award, 2017)	Ramadhani (2021)
2018	Kabupaten Layak Anak (KLA) award, Madya level	Ramadhani (2021)
2019	Kabupaten Layak Anak (KLA) award, Madya level	Ramadhani (2021)
2020	Best video award (Makassar language), South Sulawesi National Children's Day commemoration	Ramadhani (2021)

3.2 The roles of children's forum, Gowa

The findings indicate that the Gowa Children's Forum has played multiple roles in advancing child participation and promoting child well-being at the local level. Rather than functioning solely as a representative body, the forum has facilitated communication between children and local government while supporting the implementation of child-responsive policies and programs. Analysis of the interview and documentary data identified four interrelated roles that characterize the forum's contribution. These roles encompass the promotion of children's participation rights, the provision of opportunities for self-expression, support for equitable educational access, and advocacy on priority child-related issues. Table 2 summarizes these roles and their corresponding activities.

Table 3. Roles of Children's Forum Gowa in promoting child well-being.

Role	Main Activity / Instrument	Period
Strengthening children's participation rights	<i>Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan Anak</i> (Musrenbang Anak; Child Development Planning Forum) conducted from the village to the regency level; Gowa initiated this program in 2017 as the first regency in South Sulawesi	Since 2017; interviews conducted in December 2020
Providing space for freedom of expression	<i>Kongres Anak Kabupaten Gowa</i> (Gowa Children's Congress), Children's Forum capacity-building activities, and Child Ambassador selection	2019 Children's Congress (50 participants)
Supporting equitable access to education	Advocacy related to free education and the Grade Promotion System (<i>Sistem Kelas Tuntas Berkelanjutan [SKTB]</i>); child marriage prevention campaigns	2018–2020
Addressing priority child issues	Annual Musrenbang Anak priority agendas, including child marriage, bullying, and stunting, implemented through programs such as SOP PERAK, Anti-Bullying Workshops, and SEBTA	2019–2020

As shown in Table 3, the Gowa Children's Forum adopts a multifaceted approach to child participation by combining advocacy, consultation, and community engagement. The identified roles demonstrate that children's participation extends beyond symbolic involvement, enabling children to contribute to local planning processes, express their aspirations through institutional forums, and engage in campaigns addressing educational and social issues. These activities also illustrate how the forum supports the implementation of the Child-Friendly Regency/City (KLA) framework by translating policy commitments into participatory practices. The following sections discuss each role in greater detail, drawing on interview evidence and documentary sources to explain how these contributions have strengthened child participation and child well-being in Gowa Regency.

3.2.1 Strengthening children's participation rights

The most institutionalized role of Children's Forum Gowa is enabling children's participation in local development planning through *Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan Anak* (Musrenbang Anak), held from the village to the regency level. According to the Wakil *Chairperson* of the Children's Forum (2020):

"In my opinion, the role of the Children's Forum pertains to their right to participation... The Children's Development Planning Deliberation (Musrenbang Anak) has been in place since 2017 in Gowa Regency. Gowa Regency became one of the pioneers in implementing the Children's Musrenbang across Indonesia... and the first in South Sulawesi." (AA, 16, Vice Chairperson of the Children's Forum, interview, Gowa, 25 December 2020)

The *Chairperson* of the Children's Forum Gowa described how the Musrenbang process is structured around the CRC-based clusters, resembling a focus group discussion format:

"Last year, we conducted the district-level Children's Development Planning Deliberation (Musrenbang Anak). We gathered several schools... then divided them into

clusters based on the Convention on the Rights of the Child from 1 to 5... we guided them to voice their opinions, using a Focus Group Discussion model." (SW, 17, Chairperson of the Children's Forum, interview, Gowa, 25 December 2020)

A DP3A official affirmed the institutional value of this platform for civil rights fulfillment and adult recognition of children's views:

"The Children's Forum serves as a platform for children to channel their hobbies, express their creativity, and fulfill their civil rights and freedoms in accordance with the CRC... their aspirations are better heard by adults." (HH, Head of the Child Rights Fulfillment Sub-division, DP3A Gowa Regency, interview, Gowa, 28 December 2020)

Read against Hart's (1992) Ladder, this description places Musrenbang Anak at a comparatively high rung: children organize input by CRC cluster and present it directly to officials such as the Head of BAPPEDA, rather than being merely present as a formality. This is consistent with Hastira et al.'s (2024) finding that Surabaya's CFCI mechanisms meet Hart's & Lundy's participation standards, suggesting that Musrenbang-style mechanisms can support relatively high-rung participation across different Indonesian localities when institutionalized consistently.

3.2.2 Providing space for freedom of expression

Children's Forum Gowa also functions as a space for children to express views and concerns through both regular and occasional programs, and through the annual Kongres Anak Kabupaten Gowa. The 2019 congress, which also served as the selection event for Duta Anak Kabupaten Gowa, brought together approximately 50 children from Children's Forum and partner schools and was officially opened by the Assistant for Government Affairs of Gowa Regency.

"We held an activity to strengthen the Children's Forum, which was followed by the selection of the Gowa Regency Child Ambassador in 2019... there were several event series, such as a sharing session with representatives of the Regency Government, which fostered a dialogue with the children." (AA, Vice Chairperson of the Children's Forum, interview, Gowa, 25 December 2020)

This role corresponds to Lundy's (2007) "space" and "voice" elements of Article 12 implementation: the congress physically brings children together (space) and structures a sharing session in which they can speak (voice). Whether this translates into "audience" and "influence"—the two elements Lundy identifies as most often missing—is addressed further in Section 3.4.

3.2.3 Supporting equitable access to education

Children's Forum Gowa's advocacy connects to the regency's free-education policy and the Sistem Kelas Tuntas Berkelanjutan (SKTB), and includes outreach to children in minority or marginalized situations, such as street-vending children. The former Chairperson Children's Forum (2018–2019 period) described this focus:

"Broadly speaking, during my tenure (2018–2019), there were several work programs that succeeded and reached marginalized children, such as street children and children in scavenger communities, who were previously underserved... The Children's Forum serves as a bridge between the children in Gowa Regency and the government." (MAT, 18, Chairperson of the Children's Forum 2018–2019, interview, Gowa, 23 December 2020)

The forum's campaign against child marriage — carried under the tagline *“Pelaminan bukan tempat bermain anak”* — is presented by informants as connected to keeping children in school:

“Since the establishment of the Children’s Forum, the rate of child marriage in Gowa Regency has been somewhat addressed, although remote areas remain difficult to reach. Naturally, with the reduction in child marriage rates, the proportion of children who can access education will certainly increase.” (SW, Chairperson of the Children’s Forum 2020–2021, interview, Gowa, 25 December 2020)

This connection between child-marriage prevention and continued schooling is consistent with Kertati's (2023) analysis of local governments' role in child-marriage prevention, which similarly frames early marriage as a direct disruptor of school continuation, and with Masse et al.'s (2025) systematic review linking early-marriage history to elevated stunting risk—indicating that Children’s Forum's education- and marriage-related work in Gowa addresses issues that the broader literature treats as interconnected rather than separate.

3.2.4 Focusing on priority child issues

Each year's Musrenbang Anak in Gowa has centered on three recurring priority issues: child marriage, bullying, and stunting. Follow-up work programs include SOP PERAK (child-marriage prevention socialization), Workshop Anti-Bullying, and SEBTA (joint health activities addressing stunting), the latter implemented in partnership with the regency's *Tim Penggerak PKK*. A Children’s Forum member described the stunting-related collaboration:

“Regarding the issue of stunting, which is also a priority issue in the Children’s Forum work program, we collaborate with the Gowa Regency PKK... we in the Children’s Forum also created a work program whose core value lies in educating children about stunting and its prevention.” (AM, 17, Member of the Children’s Forum, interview, Gowa, 27 December 2020)

The fact that Children’s Forum’s internal discussions focused so heavily on child marriage, bullying, and stunting is significant because these three issues also recur across the broader Indonesian child-welfare literature as interlinked risks (Kertati, 2023; Masse et al., 2025), suggesting that Gowa's children, through Musrenbang, independently identified priorities that align with what national research treats as high-burden issues.

3.3 Challenges facing children’s forum Gowa

Children’s Forum Gowa faces several structural challenges that constrain its capacity to promote child well-being across the district. Since its establishment in 2011, the organization's activities have remained largely concentrated in lowland sub-districts, with highland areas such as Malino and Tinggimoncong receiving comparatively infrequent programming due to distance, limited transportation access, and a shortage of local coordinators capable of sustaining outreach in these regions. Compounding this geographic imbalance is limited and inconsistent funding, as the forum depends substantially on members' own contributions, with DP3A providing support only for specific activities and BAPPEDA financing logistics related to Musrenbang, while partner organizations such as LBH APIK Makassar contribute additional assistance on an occasional basis. Furthermore, cooperation from local government has not always been forthcoming, as coordinating venues and securing permissions with certain village and sub-district administrations has, at times, proven slow and bureaucratically layered, occasionally forcing Children’s Forum to relocate planned activities. Taken together, these challenges highlight the need for more

equitable resource distribution, diversified funding mechanisms, and stronger institutional support if Children's Forum Gowa is to sustain and expand its impact across the district.

Table 4. Challenges facing Children's Forum Gowa in promoting child well-being

Challenge	Description
Limited outreach to highland (<i>dataran tinggi</i>) sub-districts	Since its founding in 2011, most Children's Forum Gowa activities have concentrated in lowland sub-districts. Programs in highland areas such as Malino and Tinggimoncong have been infrequent, constrained by distance, transportation access, and a shortage of local coordinators.
Limited and inconsistent funding	Children's Forum Gowa relies substantially on members' own contributions (<i>iuran</i>). DP3A directly funds only specific activities, while Musrenbang logistics are supported by BAPPEDA. Partner organizations such as LBH APIK Makassar occasionally provide additional financial support.
Limited cooperation from local government	Coordinating venues and permissions with some village/sub-district administrations has been reported as slow and bureaucratically layered, at times requiring Children's Forum to relocate planned activities.

3.3.1 Limited outreach to highland sub-districts

Gowa Regency spans both lowland and highland terrain, and Children's Forum's activities have historically concentrated in lowland sub-districts. The 2019 *Chairperson* Children's Forum recalled:

"During my term, one of the main challenges was that when executing our work programs, we rarely reached the highland areas such as Malino, Tinggimoncong, and other upper districts... those who attended the events were only a few Children's Forum members who actually originated from those highland districts." (MAT, Chairperson of the Children's Forum 2018–2019, interview, Gowa, 23 December 2020)

The 2020 *Wakil Chairperson* added that logistics, not just distance, were a constraint, noting a failed attempt to borrow the DP3A's protection vehicle (Molin):

"We once carried out a work program in the highland area. However, that was a long time ago, and the process—from obtaining permits to executing the activity—was quite time-consuming due to location access, while several members faced transportation constraints... We also attempted to borrow the Molin (Mobil Perlindungan Perempuan dan Anak), but we were unable to secure it at that time." (AA, Vice Chairperson of the Children's Forum, interview, Gowa, 25 December 2020)

The fact that two consecutive Children's Forum leaders independently raised the same issue regarding highland access strongly suggests this is a deeply rooted, structural problem rather than a one-off issue. This finding echoes Octarra et al.'s (2022) national observation that a large share of adolescents are simply never invited to participate—in Gowa's case, the invitation gap appears correlated with physical accessibility rather than random chance.

3.3.2 Limited and inconsistent funding

Because its members are children, Children's Forum Gowa has limited independent capacity to raise funds, and DP3A support does not cover all program costs.

"So far, the funding for the Children's Forum mostly comes from membership dues. We raise our own funds. We receive financial support when collaborating with NGOs, such as LBH APIK, which routinely helps provide funds for work programs and transportation costs." (SW, Chairperson of the Children's Forum, interview, Gowa, 2020)

"DP3A provided funding during the Child National Day celebration in Gowa Regency in 2019 and the 2P (Pelopor dan Pelapor) Training. Meanwhile, for the execution of the Children's Musrenbang, we were supported by the Regional Development Planning Agency (Bappeda) of Gowa Regency." (AA, Vice Chairperson of the Children's Forum, interview, Gowa, 25 December 2020)

This funding pattern mirrors Riadigos & Gradaille's (2023) finding in Teo, Spain, that municipal child-participation forums typically depend heavily on adult institutional support for logistics and resources rather than achieving independent financial capacity, and Beneyto & Lopez's (2023) analysis of participatory budgeting initiatives across the Spanish Network of Child-Friendly Cities, which similarly found that funding for children's participatory processes is usually folded into broader municipal budgets rather than ring-fenced specifically for children.

3.3.3 Limited cooperation from local government

Coordinating with some village/sub-district administrations for venues and permissions has, at times, been slow:

"So far, in executing our work programs, the challenge lies with the local government authorities we visit to carry out these programs... one of the factors that prolongs the process is when we are directed to the RT (Neighborhood Head), and then the RT asks us to go to the Lurah (Urban Village Head), where the process is also quite time-consuming." (SW, Chairperson of the Children's Forum, interview, Gowa, 2020)

This bureaucratic-layering pattern is consistent with Setyamandani & Firdausi's (2023) broader observation that KLA implementation success depends on the strength and clarity of supporting regulation; even where a regency-level Perda exists, as in Gowa, translating it into consistent sub-district-level cooperation appears to require additional coordination effort,

3.4 Integrative discussion

While the preceding sections have explained the roles and challenges of the Gowa Children's Forum based on empirical evidence, the significance of these findings becomes clearer when interpreted alongside previous studies. Comparing the present findings with earlier research provides an opportunity to identify common patterns, contextual differences, and the unique contributions of this study to the broader literature on child participation and child-friendly governance. Such comparison is particularly important because children's participation is shaped not only by legal frameworks but also by institutional capacity, resource availability, socio-economic conditions, and local governance arrangements, which vary across regions and countries. By examining studies conducted in both Indonesia and international contexts, this analysis highlights how the experiences of the Gowa Children's Forum reflect broader challenges while also revealing distinctive characteristics associated with decentralized governance in Indonesia. Table 4 presents a comparative overview of five representative studies and illustrates how the findings of the present study complement, confirm, and extend existing knowledge on child participation and the implementation of Child-Friendly Regency/City (KLA) initiatives. Table 5 situates these findings against five comparable studies from Indonesia and internationally.

Table 5. Positioning of this study relative to comparable Indonesian and international research.

Study (Location)	Focus	Relation to this study
Riadigos & Gradaille (2023), Teo, Spain	Municipal child-participation forum, perceived benefits and limits	Comparable Forum-based case: similar adult-centric constraints and dependence on adult logistics
Body et al. (2024), England	Socio-economic disparity in children's civic learning	Conceptually parallel disparity: wealth-based gap in England mirrors highland/lowland gap in Gowa
Setyamandani & Firdausi (2023), Probolinggo	Legal/regulatory basis for KLA	Highlights the role of a strong regional regulation, which Gowa also has, but which this study finds is not sufficient alone to guarantee equitable funding
Hastira et al. (2024), Surabaya	CFCI implementation and Hart's/Lundy's models	Contrasting case: Surabaya's more resourced, internationally-recognized model versus Gowa's government-dependent model
Padayachee et al. (2023), Umbumbulu, South Africa	Community-based participatory action research with children	Parallel finding: well-designed participatory interventions can still fall short of intended change in under-resourced settings

As shown in Table 5, the findings both reinforce and extend existing scholarship on children's participation. Consistent with previous studies, meaningful child participation remains closely influenced by institutional capacity, adult facilitation, and the availability of resources. However, this study further demonstrates that a supportive regulatory framework alone does not guarantee effective participation. Despite Gowa Regency's relatively strong legal foundation for child-friendly governance, unequal resource distribution and continued dependence on government support constrain the sustainability and inclusiveness of participatory initiatives. These findings contribute to the literature by illustrating how local governance structures, institutional commitment, and contextual resource disparities interact to shape the effectiveness of children's participation in decentralized governance.

By examining Midgley's (1995) social welfare framework, we can see that Children's Forum Gowa's four roles indicate that the forum contributes to child well-being primarily in its non-material dimensions: empowerment (children gaining confidence and a formal channel to raise concerns) and social capital (structured cooperation between children, DP3A, BAPPEDA, and civil-society partners such as LBH APIK). At the same time, the three challenges identified—limited highland outreach, funding constraints, and uneven local cooperation—indicate that these benefits are not yet distributed evenly across the regency. Children in lowland, more accessible sub-districts appear to have more consistent opportunities to participate than those in highland areas such as Malino and Tinggimoncong, a pattern consistent with the Social Welfare Approach's concern for equitable access to welfare-generating institutions, and structurally similar to the socio-economic participation gap Body et al. (2024) documented among English schoolchildren.

By examining Hart's (1992) Ladder of Participation, the Musrenbang Anak mechanism reflects a comparatively high rung of engagement: children are consulted, organize their own input by CRC cluster, and present it directly to officials, rather than being merely present as a formality, a pattern broadly comparable to Surabaya's CFCI model (Hastira et al., 2024). However, the findings on funding and access constraints suggest that this level of engagement is not uniformly available to all Children's Forum members. Children from highland sub-districts, who are less able to attend preparatory and Musrenbang sessions, are likely to experience a lower rung of practical involvement than their lowland counterparts, even where the formal mechanism is designed to include them. This is an interpretive conclusion based on the access and funding data. Because the original fieldwork did not directly assess participation quality at the sub-district level, dedicated follow-up research would be required to confirm this trend. This caution is consistent with

Hart's later reflection (2008) that the Ladder should guide judgment rather than substitute for it.

We can get a much clearer, more nuanced picture of this issue by using Lundy's (2007) framework. Space and voice appear reasonably well established in Gowa; children have designated forums (*Musrenbang, Kongres Anak*) and a structured way to speak (cluster-based FGDs). Audience also appears present, since officials including BAPPEDA leadership and DPRD members are reported to attend and receive recommendations directly. Influence, whether those recommendations demonstrably change budget or policy outcomes, is the element this study is least able to confirm, since the original fieldwork did not track the downstream fate of specific *Musrenbang Anak* proposals. This is consistent with the broader pattern Octarra et al. (2022) describe for Indonesia, and with the OECD's (2023) observation that giving children voice does not, by itself, guarantee that this voice carries influence over outcomes. It is also consistent with Sabariego et al.'s (2023) finding, across nine Spanish municipalities, that local governments' political discourse on child participation does not always translate into a clearly visible link between children's input and final policy decisions, even where participation structures are well established.

The forum's emphasis on cluster-based discussion and progressively involving children in *Musrenbang* planning also resonates with Esteban et al.'s (2022) concept of progressive autonomy, under which children's participation rights are recognized as expanding gradually as they demonstrate agency, rather than being granted in full or withheld entirely. Children's Forum Gowa's practice of involving *Duta Anak* and long-serving members in more visible advocacy roles, while newer or younger members participate primarily through structured cluster discussions, is broadly consistent with this graduated view of participation, though the original fieldwork did not set out to test this distinction directly.

When compared to the case of Teo, Spain (Riadigos & Gradaille, 2023), Gowa's experience highlights a similar reliance on adult-provided logistics and institutional goodwill rather than a self-sufficient forum budget or independent transportation capacity, but Gowa's added complication is topographic: unlike the more compact municipal setting studied in Teo, Gowa's highland–lowland divide introduces a geographic dimension to the funding and cooperation constraints that is not foregrounded in the Teo account. This suggests that policy prescriptions transferred directly from more compact or better-resourced Forum-based case studies (e.g., Teo, Surabaya) may need adaptation for geographically diverse regencies like Gowa—a concern also raised generally by Mateos-Blanco et al. (2022), who found that rural and geographically marginal contexts remain comparatively under-studied in the child participation literature.

Shier's (2001) Pathways to Participation model offers a complementary way to read these findings, since it asks not only how far up a ladder an organization has climbed but whether participation is an “opening” (something adults are willing to allow), an “opportunity” (something adults have the resources and skills to enable), or an “obligation” (something built into procedure regardless of individual adults' willingness). Gowa's *Musrenbang Anak* appears to have moved beyond a mere opening—it recurs annually and is written into the forum's expected activities—toward an obligation at the regency level, since DP3A and BAPPEDA support it as a matter of routine. However, the same cannot yet be said at the village/sub-district level, where the reported delays in obtaining RT/RW and Lurah cooperation (Section 3.3.3) suggest that, at that lower administrative tier, children's participation still functions closer to an “opening” contingent on individual officials' willingness to cooperate, rather than a guaranteed obligation. This tiered pattern—obligation at the regency level, opening at the village level—is, to this study's knowledge, not explicitly described in the existing Indonesian Children's Forum literature, which tends to characterize implementation capacity at a single administrative level, and represents a specific, falsifiable proposition that future multi-site research could test.

3.5 Practical Implications

Three practically oriented implications follow from these findings. To begin with, since informants across two leadership periods independently identified transportation and permitting delays as the proximate cause of limited highland outreach rather than disinterest among highland children themselves a dedicated and pre-approved logistics arrangement (for example, standing access to the DP3A protection vehicle, Molin, for Children's Forum highland activities, rather than case-by-case borrowing) is a targeted response consistent with the specific bottleneck described, rather than a general call for "more resources." Furthermore, the finding that DP3A funding covers only specific flagship activities while routine operations depend on member contributions and NGO partners suggests that a small, ring-fenced operational budget line for Children's Forum distinct from event-specific funding could reduce dependency on the availability of partners such as LBH APIK in any given year. Lastly, the reported delays in obtaining village/sub-district-level permissions point toward a coordination gap between the regency-level Perda (No. 5/2014) and its implementation at the RT/RW and Lurah level; a standardized, time-bound permitting protocol for child-forum activities modeled on the kind of structured municipal support arrangement Riadigos and Gradaille (2023) describe for the Teo forum in Spain could shorten this process without requiring new regulation.

4. Conclusions

This study finds that Children's Forum Gowa promotes child well-being through four interrelated roles: strengthening children's participation rights (primarily through the *Musrenbang Anak* mechanism it pioneered in South Sulawesi in 2017), providing space for freedom of expression, supporting equitable access to education, and focusing advocacy on priority child issues such as child marriage, bullying, and stunting. These roles are constrained by three recurring challenges: limited outreach to highland sub-districts, limited and inconsistent funding, and uneven cooperation from some local governments. Interpreted through Midgley's Social Welfare Approach and Hart's Ladder of Participation, Children's Forum Gowa demonstrates a comparatively high formal standard of participation design, yet the practical distribution of that participation appears uneven across the regency's lowland and highland areas. Sustaining and expanding Children's Forum Gowa's contribution to child well-being will likely require dedicated budget allocation and deliberate outreach strategies for highland communities, alongside continued institutional support from DP3A and BAPPEDA Kabupaten Gowa. On a broader scale, the findings indicate that formal institutional strength, a supporting Perda, a pioneering *Musrenbang* mechanism, a multi-year record of KLA recognition is a necessary starting point, but still not enough to ensure truly equal child participation. Where a regency's geography is uneven, as in Gowa, equity requires deliberate, geography-aware implementation choices in addition to sound institutional design, a consideration that future KLA evaluation criteria and district-level program design might usefully make explicit.

This study is based on fieldwork conducted in a single regency in December 2020, with a limited number of informants, and reflects the KLA achievement record documented through 2020. It does not include quantitative measures of participation frequency by sub-district, nor does it capture developments after 2020, including any change in Gowa's KLA category. Future research should update this account with more recent KLA verification data, include children from highland sub-districts directly as informants to assess their participation experience firsthand, and, where possible, track specific *Musrenbang Anak* proposals through to budget outcomes to more directly assess Lundy's (2007) "influence" criterion.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to express sincere gratitude to the Department of Social Development and Welfare, Universitas Gadjah Mada, for the academic guidance and support during the preparation and finalization of this manuscript. Special appreciation is also extended to the Faculty of Da'wah and Communication, Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar, where this research was completed as part of the undergraduate thesis requirement. Sincere thanks are given to the Children's Forum Gowa and all child participants who shared their valuable experiences and insights. Their contributions made this research possible.

Author Contribution

Conceptualization, methodology, and data collection were conducted by N.R. Data analysis and interpretation were carried out by the same author under the supervision of the academic advisor. The author was solely responsible for the writing, revision, and final preparation of the manuscript.

Funding

This research received no external funding. It is based on the author's undergraduate thesis at Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar, self-funded as part of the degree requirement.

Ethical Review Board Statement

This study did not undergo formal review by an institutional ethics committee, as no such committee was required for undergraduate thesis research at the author's institution at the time the study was conducted (2020–2021). The research was approved by the academic supervisor as part of the undergraduate thesis process and was conducted under an official research permit issued by the relevant local government office (Kesbangpol) and the author's university, granting access to DP3A Kabupaten Gowa and Children's Forum Gowa. Ethical considerations were addressed through informed consent, voluntary participation, confidentiality of informants' identities (reflected in the use of initials in this manuscript), and coordination with DP3A as the responsible child-protection authority for informants under 18 years of age.

Informed Consent Statement

Informed consent was obtained from all subjects involved in the study, including parental/guardian or Children's Forum institutional consent for informants under 18 years of age.

Data Availability Statement

The data supporting this study derive from the author's undergraduate thesis research on the role of Children's Forum Gowa (Ramadhani, 2021). Due to ethical considerations and participant confidentiality, further data are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Conflicts of Interest

The author declares no conflict of interest.

Declaration of Generative AI Use

During the preparation of this work, the author used a generative AI tool to assist in reorganizing material from the author's undergraduate thesis (Ramadhani, 2021) into journal-article structure and in language editing. After using this tool, the author reviewed and edited the content as needed, verified all empirical claims and quotations against the original thesis source, and took full responsibility for the content of the publication.

Open Access

©2026. The author. This article is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License, which permits use, sharing, adaptation, distribution and reproduction in any medium or format, as long as you give appropriate credit to the original authors and the source, provide a link to the Creative Commons license, and indicate if changes were made. The images or other third-party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in a credit line to the material. If material is not included in the article's Creative Commons license and your intended use is not permitted by statutory regulation or exceeds the permitted use, you will need to obtain permission directly from the copyright holder. To view a copy of this license, visit: <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>

References

- Alamo-Bolanos, A., Mulero-Henriquez, I., & Morata Sampaio, L. (2024). Childhood, education, and citizen participation: A systematic review. *Social Sciences*, 13(8), 399. <https://doi.org/10.3390/socsci13080399>
- 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>
- Badan Pusat Statistik Kabupaten Gowa. (2020). *Kabupaten Gowa dalam angka 2020*. BPS Kabupaten Gowa.
- Body, A., Lau, E., Cunliffe, J., & Cameron, L. (2024). Mapping active civic learning in primary schools across England—A call to action. *British Educational Research Journal*, 50(3), 1308–1326. <https://doi.org/10.1002/berj.3975>
- Cuevas-Parra, P. (2024). Global shifts for children and young people's participation. In P. Cuevas-Parra, *Children's participation in the context of inequalities* (Studies in Childhood and Youth). Palgrave Macmillan. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-76973-3_3
- Esteban, M. B., Novella, A. M., & Martinez, M. (2022). Principle of progressive autonomy, participation, and recognition of agency: Substantive citizenship in the transition from childhood to adolescence. *Foro de Educacion*, 20(2), 134–157. <https://doi.org/10.14516/fde.929>
- Freire, K., Pope, R., Jeffrey, K., Andrews, K., Nott, M., & Bowman, T. (2022). Engaging with children and adolescents: A systematic review of participatory methods and approaches in research informing the development of health resources and interventions. *Adolescent Research Review*, 7, 335–354. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40894-022-00181-w>
- Hart, R. A. (1992). *Children's participation: From tokenism to citizenship*. UNICEF International Child Development Centre (Innocenti Essays No. 4).
- Hart, R. A. (2008). Stepping back from 'the ladder': Reflections on a model of participatory work with children. In A. Reid, B. B. Jensen, J. Nikel, & V. Simovska (Eds.), *Participation and learning* (pp. 19–31). Springer. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4020-6416-6_2
- Hastira, M. F., Abdullah, N., & Asy'ari, M. (2024). The child-friendly cities initiative program: Indonesia-UNICEF cooperation in promoting the fulfillment of children's participation rights in the development process in Surabaya. *Jurnal Penelitian Politik*, 21(1), 91–95. <https://doi.org/10.14203/jpp.v21i1.1686>
- Kementerian Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak Republik Indonesia. (2023). *Profil evaluasi Kabupaten/Kota Layak Anak 2022*. Kemen PPPA.
- Kertati, I. (2023). Peran pemerintah daerah dalam pencegahan perkawinan anak. *Mimbar Administrasi FISIP UNTAG Semarang*, 20(1), 268–276. <https://doi.org/10.56444/mia.v20i1.682>
- Laygo-Saguil, J. (2021). Exploring child leadership: Preparing leaders for sustainable education for the future. *International Journal of Research Publications*, 89(1), 287–297. <https://doi.org/10.47119/IJRP1008911120212453>

- Lundy, L. (2007). 'Voice' is not enough: Conceptualising Article 12 of the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. *British Educational Research Journal*, 33(6), 927–942. <https://doi.org/10.1080/01411920701657033>
- Masse, A. F. H., Hadi, E. N., As, M., Irzal, S. M., & Nurfatmi, R. (2025). The influence of early marriage history on stunting risk: A systematic literature review. *Jurnal Ners*, 9(81), 1388–1402. <https://doi.org/10.31004/jn.v9i2.40001>
- Mateos-Blanco, T., Sanchez-Lissen, E., Gil-Jaurena, I., & Romero-Perez, C. (2022). Child-led participation: A scoping review of empirical studies. *Social Inclusion*, 10(2), 32–42. <https://doi.org/10.17645/si.v10i2.4921>
- Midgley, J. (1995). *Social development: The developmental perspective in social welfare*. Sage Publications.
- Miles, M. B., Saldaña, J., & Huberman, A. M. (2019). *Qualitative data analysis: A methods sourcebook (4th ed.)*. Sage Publications.
- OECD. (2023). *Child participation in decision making (OECD Education Working Papers No. 301)*. OECD Publishing.
- Octarra, H. S., Iustitiani, N. S. D., & Ajisuksmo, C. R. P. (2022). *Situational analysis on child and adolescent participation and civic engagement in Indonesia*. UNICEF Indonesia.
- Padayachee, K., Maistry, S., Harris, G. T., & Lortan, D. (2023). Integral education and Ubuntu: A participatory action research project in South Africa. *South African Journal of Childhood Education*, 13(1), a1298. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajce.v13i1.1298>
- Pardo-Beneyto, G., & Abellan-Lopez, M. A. (2023). Methodologies of citizen participation with children and teenagers: An exploratory study on participatory budgeting in Spain. *Bordon. Revista de Pedagogia*, 75(1), 29–47. <https://doi.org/10.13042/Bordon.2023.95146>
- Peraturan Daerah Kabupaten Gowa Nomor 5 Tahun 2014 tentang Penyelenggaraan Perlindungan Anak.
- Peraturan Menteri Pemberdayaan Perempuan dan Perlindungan Anak Nomor 18 Tahun 2019 tentang Penyelenggaraan Children's Forum.
- Ramadhani, N. (2021). *Peran Children's Forum terhadap kesejahteraan anak di Kabupaten Gowa* [Undergraduate thesis, Universitas Islam Negeri Alauddin Makassar].
- Riadigos, J., & Gradaille, R. (2023). The forum for the participation of children and teenagers in Teo: A socio-educational context that enables children's right to participation. *Children and Youth Services Review*, 153, 107112. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.childyouth.2023.107112>
- Sabariego, M., Pose Porto, H., Sanchez, E., & Buxarraais, M. R. (2023). Child and youth participation in the municipality: Discourses and political strategies in Andalusia, Catalonia and Galicia. *Bordon. Revista de Pedagogia*, 75(1), 123–141. <https://doi.org/10.13042/Bordon.2023.96468>
- Setyamandani, E. D., & Firdausi, F. (2023). Legal policy formation of child-friendly districts. *Jurnal Cakrawala Hukum*, 14(3), 254–264. <https://doi.org/10.26905/idjch.v14i3.9814>
- Shier, H. (2001). Pathways to participation: Openings, opportunities and obligations. *Children & Society*, 15(2), 107–117. <https://doi.org/10.1002/CHI.617>
- United Nations. (1989). *Convention on the Rights of the Child*. Treaty Series, 1577(3).

Biography of Author

Nurul Ramadhani, Department of Social Development and Welfare, Faculty of Social and Political Sciences, Universitas Gadjah Mada, Sleman, Special Region of Yogyakarta 55281, Indonesia.

- Email: nurulramadhanii09@gmail.com
- ORCID: 0009-0000-1606-9035
- Web of Science ResearcherID: N/A
- Scopus Author ID: N/A
- Homepage: N/A