

The Challenges of Enhancing Participation in Urban Community Empowerment (The Case of Community Empowerment Program for Villages (PPMK) Implementation in 4 Villages in Jakarta)

Ahmad Anshori Wahdy
Department of Administration, Faculty of Social Sciences and Politics
University of Indonesia
a.anshori@gmail.com

Irfan Ridwan Maksum
Department of Administration, Faculty of Social Sciences and Politics
University of Indonesia
irm60@ui.ac.id

Linda Darmajanti
Department of Sociology, Faculty of Social Sciences and Politics
University of Indonesia
lindib_2041a@yahoo.com

Abstract

Characteristics of DKI Jakarta as Indonesian capital with a rich diversity of people from various social, cultural, and economic backgrounds, have challenging implication for participatory community empowerment. This is proven by low participation level in community affairs in the province. This research aims to assess factors responsible for low participation in community empowerment in urban areas and identify measures to improve it. The research was based on a qualitative methods in the Village Community Empowerment Program (PPMK) implemented in KampungRawa, Kalibaru, and Tanjung Duren Melawai in DKI Jakarta, Indonesia. The selection of the administrative villages was based on Social Insecurity Potential Index (IPKS) which portrays an overview of urban social structure. Research results showed that low participation in community affairs is attributable to the normative nature of participation, non-compliance of targeted groups in certain areas, lack of information, weak public institutions (Village Consultative Council/LMK), lack of adequate support from local leaders (Chief of Neighborhood Association (RT) and Chief of Community Association (RW)), and absence of management training programs. Moreover, low participation is exacerbated by low public awareness about the environment. Thus, efforts that can be undertaken include enhancing the role of the Government, implementing e-governance by RT and RW neighborhood heads as the driving force and representatives of the community.

Keywords: *e-governance, empowerment, good governance, participation, public institutions*

INTRODUCTION

Conceptually, Narayan (2002) argues that to improve corporate governance in the region, requires empowering local communities with authority and resources through mechanisms that enhance access of community members to information, strengthening inclusion and participation, enhancing Government accountability, and investing in local organization capacity. According to Abdullah (1997), there is need to nurture participation culture in various forms in society in order to ensure that everyone feels obliged to be involved in the development process. Moreover, strengthening and preserving the culture can be achieved through reproducing it in the form of speeches on the importance of community participation and by giving awards (incentives) for individuals, groups and institutions for active involvement in various development programs. Sherry Arnstein (1969), Bishop and Davis (2002), Ruth Ann Bramson (2005), and Cunningham (2010) posit the notion that it is necessary to inform the community at an early stage in the participation or involvement process. With regard to the relationship between participation and empowerment, Prasojo (2003) notes that participation is an important component of empowerment. Community empowerment as one of the instruments of local government, is imperative for local governments, DKI Jakarta Special Administrative region inclusive, to promote public prosperity. DKI Jakarta as the Indonesia's capital city has special rights which are based on Law No. 22/ 1948 on Local Governance which was amended by Law No. 29 / 2007 on DKI Jakarta government as the capital city of the Republic of Indonesia. The laws confer upon DKI Jakarta the status of a province, which comprises of 5 administrative cities and 1 administrative district that are in turn comprise 44 sub districts and 267 villages (Table 1).

Based on statistics that were released by Central bureau of statistics, Indonesia in July 2015, Jakarta has a population density of 14,506 people per km², which makes it the polity with the highest density in in the country. High population density attests to the complexity of the social and territorial

problems especially in the villages the region faces, which makes a strong case for promoting community empowerment as one of the ways to improve public service delivery to Jakarta city population. Moreover, with the large number of urban villages that integral to the provincial government in line with Law No. 29/ 2007 that are home to its residents, DKI Jakarta, has keen interest in fostering community empowerment to increase effectiveness and acceptability of its administrative and public service delivery.

Village Community Empowerment Program (PPMK) is one of the community empowerment programs which have been implemented by DKI Jakarta administration. Aims of the program entail the empowerment of under privileged citizens and granting of loans in the form of revolving funds to micro enterprises. The program offers two types of grants, inter alia, physical development and social development grant, which are designed to strengthen community network at the neighborhood level through encouraging cooperation between individuals.

Subsequently, the process is expected to nurture "social capital" or mutual trust, which in turn will enhance participation, self-reliance and community welfare in DKI Jakarta villages. In other words, PPMK is expected to serve as learning medium for village communities to be in take charge, organize activities, and interact with other members of society within an institutional framework.

In addition, the program is expected to offer community members the opportunity to learn to identify problems, devise plans, and execute programs. This corroborates with the argument advanced by Teguh (2007) that thanks to the empowerment paradigm, the community has the rights to plan and manage the resources toward local initiatives that are deemed necessary to promote community development.

However, since October 2009, PPMK implementation has been through a grant scheme that only covers funding for the development of the physical and social development. That meant that financing for economic development activities has had to be limited to utilizing financial services cooperation for village community empowerment

Table 1. Number of Districts, Villages, Community Associations, Neighborhood Associations, and Households

| DKI Jakarta | Sub districts | Hamlets | First tier neighborhoods | Second tier neighborhoods | Households |
|-------------|---------------|---------|--------------------------|---------------------------|------------|
| 2013 | 44 | 267 | 2720 | 30442 | 3066183 |
| 2012 | 44 | 267 | 2707 | 30300 | 3179640 |
| 2011 | 44 | 267 | 2705 | 30195 | 3145016 |
| 2010 | 44 | 267 | 2704 | 30215 | 2356922 |
| 2009 | 44 | 267 | 2694 | 29904 | 2149811 |

Source: Jakarta Dalam Angka 2014, BPS of the DKI Jakarta Province

(Koperasi Jasa Keuangan Pemberdayaan Ekonomi Masyarakat Kelurahan (KJKPEMK) mechanism (Mirah Sakethi, 2010). A detailed description of PPMK budget grants appear in Table 2.

The large budget allocation for PPMK attests to the need for program coordinators who bear the responsibility hence accountability for not only project the budget expenditure but also ensuring that programs achieve objectives. Pareek (2012) points out that true democracy is only possible if community participation is part of the process, with better governance as reflected in higher transparency and accountability. Similarly, Nieto (2010) also argues for the vital role that transparency plays in good governance, noting it as a priority for democratic governance. The Village Consultative Council (LMK), as a village head partner, is responsible for implementing PPMK programs.

DKI Jakarta governance in general and village administration in particular, is strongly influenced by the community social structure, and community empowerment is one of the instruments which the existing regulatory framework obliges in the conduct of services and in efforts to foster interaction among community members. To that end, absence of interaction among community members would not only undermine development efforts but also most importantly, contravenes the prevailing regulations.

To that end, DKI Jakarta government must take into serious consideration that the social structure of the community in order to

achieve its goals, comply with existing regulations in relation to policy implementation. To assess social structure status, DKI Jakarta has to base its decisions on a measure that gauges the tendency of social structure. Fortunately, the central bureau for statistics publishes an index that measures the tendency of the social structure, which it calls the Social Vulnerability Index (IPKS). IPKS is a composite index that comprises Poverty Vulnerability Index, Environment and Health Vulnerability Index, Physical Infrastructure Vulnerability Index, Social Capital Index, Security and Order Vulnerability Index, and Economic Vulnerability Index (BPS, March 27, 2014).

In 2013, BPS conducted mapping of 10 hamlets in Jakarta on the basis of IPKS scores, with results shown in Table 3. Based on Table 3, it is evident that social vulnerability index registers the highest score of all the component Indices of IPKS. Ten hamlets in DKI Jakarta which registered high IPKS indices, also have high potential for high social-capital vulnerability, which is attributable to among other factors, absence of a place of worship, community work, social gatherings, and community development activities (PKK, Karang Taruna, and Majelis Taklim).

To that end, BPS draws the conclusion that villages which have social capital vulnerability indices are those that are characterized by members knowing each other but having little interaction beyond that. Based on Table 3, it is apparent that Kampung Ra-

Table 2. Budget Allocation of PPMK Year 2010-2015

| Year | Allocation of PPMK in APBD (000) | |
|-------|----------------------------------|----------------|
| | Approved | Revised |
| 2010 | Rp.88,000,000 | Rp.88,000,000 |
| 2011 | Rp.88,000,000 | Rp.88,000,000 |
| 2012 | Rp.63,000,000 | Rp.63,000,000 |
| 2013 | Rp.53,000,000 | Rp.119,350,000 |
| 2014 | Rp.94,201,500 | Rp.94,201,500 |
| 2015 | Rp.92,475,125 | Rp.60,150,000 |
| Total | Rp.478,676,625 | Rp.12,701,500 |

Source: Data analysis on Governor Regulation year 2010-2015 concerning Grants and Social Assistance

wa, in Central Jakarta, has the highest IPKS index, and also has the second highest social capital vulnerability index. Consequently, Kampung Rawa hamlet has the highest social vulnerability index in DKI Jakarta in 2013, which is largely due to the high social-capital vulnerability score of 84,42.

In comparison, BPS also published 10 hamlets in DKI Jakarta that registered low IPKS scores data among 10 villages in DKI Jakarta as depicted in Table 4. Table 4 shows that social vulnerability index has the largest scores. It is also evident in Table 4 that 10 hamlets in DKI Jakarta with the low IPKS scores also suffered from high vulnerability to social capital related issues. Melawai hamlet registered the highest social capital vulnerability index, with a score that was in the order of 90.3. Nonetheless, the same hamlet also had the second lowest potential for social vulnerability in DKI Jakarta in 2013.

According to the IPKS data above, PPMK has been one of the DKI Jakarta government priority community empowerment programs for all hamlets in the province since 2001, it is important program implementation should take into account IPKS measurements. This is because the essence of PPMK is to strengthen community network through cooperation among individuals to foster "social capital" or mutual trust between citizens as stated in the Book of PPMK PT, Mirah Sakethi in 2010. However, in Kampung Rawa hamlet, not many people are aware of PPMK programs. This is

attested by the low public participation in the programs, a fact that was divulged during an interview with the Head of Kampung Rawa on 9 March 2015 at the hamlet administration office. Thus, low participation in PPKM, which is attributable to low public awareness of the program is a serious problem the program faces.

Furthermore, juxtaposing IPKS scores with hamlets that represent each of the four administrative cities in DKI Jakarta, shows interest results. It is evident that based on data that availability of physical development and social development activities does not guarantee PPMK effectiveness in enhancing public participation in village activities in Jakarta. To that end, hamlets that have high physical development and social development scores ironically register high social capital vulnerability scores. It is thus important that enhancing social capital must be integral to PPMK implementation. One good indicator of low public participation in budget allocation is the small amount of funds that community members contribute toward hamlet activities. Table 6 shows a summary revenue sources and expenditure of Women and Family Planning Community Empowerment Agency (BPMPKB), DKI Jakarta.

Based on Table 6, it is evident that community members contribute very little toward PPMK budget expenditure for Physical Environment Development & Social Development. In fact the community contributed less than 15% of the total PPMK budget

Table 3. 10 villages in Jakarta with highest IPKS scores 2013

| No | Kelurahan | Poverty Vulnerability Index | Environment and Health Vulnerability Index | Physical Infrastructure Vulnerability Index | Social Capital Index | Security and Order Vulnerability Index | Economic Vulnerability Index | IPKS 2013 |
|----|--------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|----------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1 | Kampung Rawa (Central Jakarta) | 37.28 | 10.64 | 56.84 | 84.42 | 37.75 | 68.59 | 44.78 |
| 2 | Kali Baru (North Jakarta) | 65.12 | 15.58 | 29.7 | 59.38 | 38.6 | 70.91 | 44.34 |
| 3 | Penjaringan (North Jakarta) | 45.96 | 37.56 | 36.2 | 71.67 | 28.72 | 67.88 | 43.21 |
| 4 | Galur (Central Jakarta) | 50.21 | 5.2 | 48.13 | 81.73 | 33.91 | 67.99 | 43.11 |
| 5 | Kampung Melayu (West Jakarta) | 48.94 | 33.51 | 62.99 | 81.7 | 16.88 | 52.13 | 41.87 |
| 6 | Ancol (North Jakarta) | 36.36 | 23.74 | 20.49 | 62.73 | 41.5 | 65.01 | 40 |
| 7 | Tanah Tinggi (Central Jakarta) | 36.89 | 11.8 | 51.86 | 68.87 | 25.38 | 72.5 | 39.73 |
| 8 | Kartini (Central Jakarta) | 32.92 | 16.41 | 31.16 | 88.03 | 31.71 | 62.09 | 38.47 |
| 9 | Manggarai (South Jakarta) | 49.33 | 16.87 | 31.08 | 67.73 | 17.41 | 78.79 | 37.66 |
| 10 | Lagoa (North Jakarta) | 36 | 17.72 | 35.51 | 57.83 | 26.21 | 72.84 | 37.45 |

Source: Central Bureau of Statistics Jakarta No. 16/03/31/Th, XVI dated 27 March 2014

for the four villages (excluding activity costs and audit costs). Outcomes of interviews with BPMPKB officials also confirmed the fact that community participation in PPMK activities as gauged from the contribution toward the budget to finance key functions fell within 20-30% range. As has been mentioned earlier, the main factor for the small contribution to PPMK activities is the little awareness of program activities in the ham-

lets (as disclosed by officials from Kampung Rawa village administration). In the same development, Arnstein and Fox as cited by Strange (2008) underscore the importance of understanding and effecting the key requirements that enhance public participation. Such requirements, according to Srinivas (1994 and UNEP Report 2003), include not only socializing the program to target groups, but also determining the target

Table 4. 10 villages in Jakarta with lowest IPKS scores 2013

| No | Kelurahan | Poverty Vulnerability Index | Environment and Health Vulnerability Index | Physical Infrastructure Vulnerability Index | Social Capital Index | Security and Order Vulnerability Index | Economic Vulnerability Index | IPKS 2013 |
|----|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|--|---|----------------------|--|------------------------------|-----------|
| 1 | Gambir (Central Jakarta) | 14.07 | 2.9 | 2.4 | 60 | 19 | 25 | 17.4 |
| 2 | Melawai (South Jakarta) | 0.1 | 1 | 1.7 | 90.3 | 21.4 | 22.7 | 17.48 |
| 3 | Kelapa Gading Timur (North Jakarta) | 4.2 | 2.5 | 15.3 | 85.7 | 12 | 34.4 | 18.97 |
| 4 | Tanjung Duren Selatan (West Jakarta) | 2.8 | 2.1 | 8.7 | 53 | 18 | 49.6 | 19.35 |
| 5 | Grogol Utara (South Jakarta) | 8.8 | 4.7 | 22.4 | 58.6 | 15.1 | 40.5 | 20.93 |
| 6 | Kelapa Gading Barat (North Jakarta) | 7.1 | 5.6 | 11.9 | 79.5 | 10.6 | 50.8 | 20.97 |
| 7 | Roa Malaka (West Jakarta) | 6.9 | 12.2 | 23.2 | 37 | 30.8 | 18.1 | 21.6 |
| 8 | Sunter Jaya (North Jakarta) | 9.1 | 6.3 | 15.9 | 55.5 | 18.1 | 47.7 | 22.02 |
| 9 | Rawa Barat (South Jakarta) | 9.8 | 9.8 | 14.8 | 83.1 | 15.7 | 37.6 | 22.33 |
| 10 | Cikoko (South Jakarta) | 6.6 | 2.7 | 21 | 58.4 | 17 | 54.2 | 22.7 |

Source: Central Bureau of Statistics Jakarta No. 16/03/31/Th, XVI dated 27 March 2014

groups, building strong community organization, helping local leaders, and initiating training.

Thus, conducting research to assess and determine root causes of the problem of low public participation in community empowerment can help in identifying measures to improve and enhance it. Moreover, findings of the preliminary research will also highlight the public participation in community empowerment programs can be enhanced in a diversity ways that reflect the

variety of the population and their varied interests in DKI Jakarta.

RESEARCH METHODS

This research is based on the post-positivism paradigm, and employs qualitative research methodology to obtain in-depth information on public participation in PPMK community empowerment in selected DKI Jakarta villages in Kampung Rawa village, Johar Baru (Central Jakarta); Kali Baru vil-

Table 5. Village based on representation of the Administrative City, the Highest and Lowest IPKS Data, and Level of Social Capital Vulnerability

| Village | Administrative City | Ranks on the Highest and Lowest IPKS, and Level of Social Capital Vulnerability |
|-----------------------|---------------------|--|
| Kampung Rawa | Central Jakarta | It is selected by taking into consideration the position it has as the first rank on the IPKS score and having social capital that is more vulnerable than in Gambir district. |
| Melawai | South Jakarta | It is selected by taking into consideration its second position in among lowest IPKS scores and the the high social capital vulnerability; the hamlet is chosen to represent South Jakarta because Central Jakarta is already represented by Kampung Rawa village. |
| Kali Baru | North Jakarta | It is selected by considering its position in the second rank of the highest IPKS after Kampung Rawa. |
| Tanjung Duren Selatan | West Jakarta | It is selected by because the hamlet represents West Jakarta, which has a higher rank than RoaMalaka among hamlets with low IPKS |

lage and Cilincing (North Jakarta); (3) Melawai village and Kebayoran Baru (South Jakarta); and (4) Tanjung Duren Selatan and Grogol Petamburan (West Jakarta). The selection of informants was based on the extent to which they were considered knowledgeable about community participation and PPMK community empowerment programs, capacity, competences, the extent to which they represented village administrations, relevant city and provincial administrative offices, and representation of structured community groups such as second tier neighborhoods (RW) and first tier neighborhoods (RT), and general citizens. In-depth interview and review of relevant documents served as techniques that were used to collect the data. Meanwhile, data analysis was based on successive approximation analysis and validity strategy of triangulation using various data sources (relevant documents and interviews with various competent parties) were employed by examining the evidence from these sources to identify patterns that subsequently formed themes. Themes were then assessed and examined in line the research objectives to determine whether or not they provided answers to the research questions of this research.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Cause of the Low Community Participation

Based on the analysis of field data, it became evident that public participation at the planning stage is still very low in all hamlets that formed the locus of the research. Not all people are aware of PPMK at the planning stage. This was disclosed by a BPMPKB official who is based in DKI Jakarta. "At the planning stage, public involvement is indeed rather low, because at that stage when activities are being proposed, we do not involve community members that much.

Actually, the procedure or mechanism starts with RT, RW, and then to the village administration. Thanks to RT, the management of people's aspirations goes on well, hence must be involved. However, most of the participation occurs at the level of implementing activities ... " To that end, at the implementation stage, the level of public participation is somewhat different. This was disclosed by informants who were drawn from both the village community and village administrations. At the implementation stage, community participation is obvious,

Table 6. Budget Realization and source for PPMK Physical and Social Development Activities in Kampung Rawa, Melawai, Kali Baru, and South Tanjung Duren hamlets (2014)

| Village | Activity | Budget Source year 2014 (Rp.) | | Total Budget and Realization (Rp.) |
|-----------------------|---|-------------------------------|------------------|------------------------------------|
| | | PPMK | Community | |
| Kampung Rawa | Physical Environment Development & Social Development | 246,750,000 | 4,645,000 (2%) | 251,395,000 |
| Melawai | | 113,750,000 | 7,000,000 (6%) | 120,750,000 |
| Kali Baru | | 337,750,000 | 10,370,000 (3%) | 348,120,000 |
| Tanjung Duren Selatan | | 269,500,000 | 29,525,000 (11%) | 299,025,000 |

Source: Implementation of Physical Environment Development & Social Development PPMK year 2014 (2015)

mainly occurs in the Physical Environment Development activities through construction works in the neighborhood such as road and RW office structures. Thus, at this stage, community members participate directly in community development activities. Besides, community members contribute money as well as other forms of contribution that include offering meals, snacks, and drinks to those who are directly involved in working on the project.

It is also true that the incentive to participate at this stage is motivated by the fact that the benefits are easy to perceive by members of the community. On the contrary, participation in Social Development activities is often not as active because such activities do not reflect the need of the village and its population, but simply are conducted to meet the requirements that are laid out in the budget allocation procedures. It must be noted, moreover, the budget allocation for social development activities while separate from that for physical Development, is often based on the latter. This creates a problem because tying social development programs to physical development programs rather than based on public needs, leads to a situation where the community cannot get the benefits in participating in such programs hence opting not to participate.

The gradual development of the participation in community empowerment programs in DKI Jakarta villages was based on

the results of a research on 4 villages with different characteristics. Public participation was gauged from degree of involvement in PPMK activities. Nonetheless, based on results of this research it became evident that public participation in community development was very normative. This is because people were not directly involved in setting the agenda, rather that function was delegated to their representatives (the Community Empowerment Care Group), which was formed for the single purpose of carrying out PPMK activities in each RW that were beneficiaries of the budget. In addition, participation is also possible during initial meetings that discuss socialization plans which are mandatory in PPMK activities and included in the budget through activity costs allocations (Biaya Kegiatan Lapangan or BKL).

Besides, public participation in PPMK can be achieved by making use of informal forums such as social gatherings, RW meetings, and gymnastics. Nonetheless, such efforts are ineffective because they do not involve all parties that are relevant to PPMK activities. Meanwhile, RW meetings are conducted on the basis of characteristics of adjacent houses. This is the practice that is used in Kampung Rawa and Kali Baru. However, such a practice would be ineffective in areas such as Tanjung Duren Selatan and Melawai where the location of houses (households) is far from one another.

Thus, the most appropriate way to enhance cooperation and community participation in areas which have houses that are distant from one another is the use of gymnastics exercises for the elderly as well as social gatherings. Nonetheless, based on research results, enhancing public participation through informal forums may not contribute to higher public involvement in community development programs because of a tenuous if any, connection between such forums and community development programs and activities. In any case, such forums draw the participation of citizens whose interests relate to services that are served in those forums, hence do not transcend or spillover into supporting the participation in activities that are not related to forum activities and services. In any case, informal forums are exclusive not inclusive by nature, which limited their effectiveness as venues to enhance public participation of all citizens.

Ensuring that programs benefits reach the targeted population is an important way to induce participation. Based on research conducted in the 4 villages, results indicated that improvement in the criteria used to determine target groups can increase community participation in PPMK implementation. The criteria used in determining target population for PPMK programs is based on gubernatorial regulations, which by and large, is normative. To that end, changing the criteria to one that reflect conditions on the ground can enhance public participation. A good example of this was the case of Tanjung Duren Selatan and Melawai which are two cases where criteria was changed and contributed to higher community participation, and where normative criteria was not changed and hampered public participation, respectively.

With regards to the socialization of PPMK activities to the community, a BPMPKB official from DKI Jakarta noted that "... One alternative is for the village administration to invite provincial government officials to come and attend program socialization events. Such a practice can help in enhancing transparency of programs to both the community and the provincial administration. Moreover, inviting provincial officials would also enhance the salien-

cy of the socialization exercise, with the consequence that many community members will attend, and lively dialogue between village administration officials on one hand, and provincial officials and village community members would occur, leading to good insights on opaque issues all of which would be beneficial for program effectiveness.

Unfortunately, many village administration are reluctant to invite provincial staff to attend socialization exercises because of fears that any modicum of lack of transparency in program design and execution would be disclosed to provincial government officials and the village community. .." Based on the above statement it is apparent that socialization of PPMK is still low. There are still many village authorities that are reluctant to invite officials from provincial administrations, even though disclosure of information in implementing PPMK is one of the requirements village administrations must meet. There is a high like hood that LMK which holds ultimate responsibility for PPMK programs does not have sufficient information it can disclose to the public, or that information is fraught with loopholes that community members can identify if at all they are given the opportunity.

Lack of transparency, however, undermines the number and type of assistance RTs and RWs as the local community receive to support community development programs. There is absence of information on the PPMK targeting and distribution of expenditure from RT heads. Moreover, even those who have knowledge of such activities, they lack sufficient understanding of such activities. To that end, without sufficient knowledge and understanding of PPMK activities among village administration officials, complicates coordination efforts with community members who are the program beneficiaries.

To compound things, training in urban management in relation to PPMK activities to RW and RT heads and staff, which should have equipped them with knowledge and understanding of the essence, importance and benefits to society, has never been done. This is clearly shown in a progress report that was compiled by LMK Kali Baru in the

fiscal year 2014 that underscored the need for training in financial management, an indication that such training while important for program activities has never been done. "there is need to conduct financial management training for PPMK actors in particular at the RW level to enable them to complete a good report" (Source: Progress Report of the Social Development Program and Activity Costs (BKL) PPMK 2014, reported in 2015). In the same vein, the same problem is evident in a progress report that was compiled by LMK Kampung Rawa that noted that "Low capacity and understanding of PPMK management in developing plans, implementing, and making accountability and financial reports undermine the quality of implementation and the report" (Source: Report on the Implementation of the Physical Environment and community development community development Social PPMK fiscal year 2014, reported in 2015),

In addition, based on results of this research, it is was revealed that DKI Jakarta citizens that were covered by this study, paid little concern for their neighborhoods. Some of the reasons attributable for that include the tough times to eke out a living in a very difficult environment consumes most of their time. As Kali Baru LMK head reiterated "First, they (community members) are not well informed. Secondly, they don't care about their living environment. Thirdly, they suffer from apathy to the neighborhood".

Thus, growing indifference of the society is recognized as one of the factors that are undermining community participation. In addition, based on excerpt of an interview with a Kali Baru village official, he noted that "Returning home from office, they (community members) prefer to spend their time sleeping hence pay less attention to their neighborhoods, whether they have something to eat or not. That's the case". The import of statement by LMK Head in Kampung Rawa village also amounted to the same thing. "...That's it, actually community participation is very good, but some pay attention, while others don't. Why do they don't care? Because they have to open their shops daily. That is where care is needed, (creating) a self-help society". Thus, society members face the problem of time constrain

to balance between earning a living for their households and contributing to the development of the community where they live.

In fact, the condition in Melawai village, is not any different. Excerpt of an interview with LMK Secretary in the village, it was disclosed that time constraints and having to conduct business activities (earning a living) are key factors that undermine efforts of community members to pay more attention to their neighborhoods that they currently exhibit. Table 7, provides a detailed description of the research results on this issue.

Efforts to Improve Public Participation in DKI Jakarta Village Communities

As has been noted earlier, Edwards (2013) contends that in the 21st century, community participation can be achieved through the development of culture and capacity of the citizenry by making use of local government regulations. To that end, Edward's argument underscores the fact that local government is very vital in enhancing public participation. Meanwhile, with respect to societal cultural development, local authorities, in this case local leaders, must play leading role in providing necessary efforts to design programs create opportunities for public participation. Local leaders have since 2001 been equipped with the mandate to create opportunities, one of which is the establishment of PPMK. From the normative perspective, therefore, PPMK has already opened immense opportunity for public participation.

Nonetheless, community empowerment in the selected DKI Jakarta villages is inseparable from regulations that underpin it, including regulations PPMK implementation as one of the programs that DKI Jakarta to enhance community welfare. This is coupled with the regulation that underpins the establishment of LMK, which is a community representative body. The two regulations, as outlined in the previous section, in general lay the foundation for promoting for transparency as mandated by DKI Jakarta Government. With respect to community empowerment, DKI Jakarta government, issued Gubernatorial regulation No. 171 / 2016 that lay guidelines on household neighborhoods (RTs) and a collection of house-

Table 7. Village Community Empowerment Program Implementation (PPMK) In Kampung Rawa, Kali Baru, Tanjung Duren Selatan and Melawai

| No | Qualitative Parameter | VILLAGES | | | | DESCRIPTION |
|----|--|--|--|--|--|---|
| | | KAMPUNG RAWA | KALI BARU | TANJUNG DUREN SELATAN | MELAWAI | |
| 1 | Gradual Development of Participation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community participation is through PPMK initial meeting socialization to KPPM as community representatives Achieved through attending informal forums such as rembugRW and social gatherings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community participation through PPMK initial meeting and socialization to KPPM as community representatives The effort is achieved by attending informal forums such as social gatherings | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community participation through PPMK initial meeting and socialization to KPPM as community representatives The effort is achieved through attending informal forums such as gymnastics for the elderly | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community participation through PPMK initial meeting and socialization to KPPM as community representatives The effort is achieved through attending informal forums such as gymnastics for the elderly | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Participation development is largely normative through PPMK initial meetings in socialization and attended by KPPM as community representatives Informal forums are not accessible to the parties that are relevant to PPMK |
| 2 | Determination of beneficiaries (target groups) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Normative criteria used in determining target groups based on PPMK implementation regulations (Governor Regulation) Target groups must meet the normative criteria as mandated in PPMK regulation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Normative criteria used in determining target groups based on PPMK implementation regulations (Governor Regulation) Target groups must meet the normative criteria as mandated in PPMK regulation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Normative criteria used in determining target groups based on PPMK implementation regulations (Governor Regulation) Target groups must meet the normative criteria as mandated in PPMK regulation | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Normative criteria used in determining target groups based on PPMK implementation regulations Target groups do not meet the normative criteria (they don't need PPMK) | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> The normative criteria for beneficiaries / target groups are stipulated in Governor Regulation on PPMK Implementation. However, during the implementation phase, the criteria needs adjustment; for example, criteria for Tanjung Duren Selatan is different from that applied in Melawai |

| | |
|---|--|
| <p>3</p> <p>Socialization to selected beneficiaries (target groups)</p> <p>Little socialization, as reflected in LMK lacking an effective socialization mechanism; the socialization only invites LMK representatives in each community neighborhood, who disseminate the information to neighborhoods they represent</p> <p>LMK provides little information to community representatives such as RW and RT heads, which leads to poor understanding and coordination of PPMK activities by program beneficiaries</p> | <p>The information does not reach the society as it is disseminated by LMK representatives in each RW. However, they perceive the community to be already well-informed</p> <p>Little information from community representatives such as LMK, RT and RW heads which creates little knowledge, misunderstanding and coordination problems among community members</p> <p>Socialization of program information is still limited in all villages, LMK as the community representative is not effective in reaching out to community members</p> |
| <p>4</p> <p>Strong community organization (LMK)</p> | <p>Only one LMK personnel for each RW is considered not capable of accommodating and coordinating the society participation</p> <p>LMK dominates the implementation of PPMK programs and with little involvement of village heads</p> <p>Only one LMK personnel for each RW is considered not capable of accommodating and coordinating the society participation</p> <p>LMK dominates the implementation of PPMK programs and with little involvement of village heads</p> <p>There is tendency for LMK to become "the single player"</p> <p>There are no coordination issues between LMK and village head</p> <p>Dualism in the role of LMK as officials in charge of PPMK and as partner of the village head leads to sub-optimization of LMK</p> |
| <p>5</p> <p>The assistance RW and RT heads give in their capacity as local leaders</p> | <p>RT does not have good understanding of PPMK empowerment program, which hampers communication with target groups in giving assistance in implementing the programs</p> <p>RT does not have good understanding of PPMK community empowerment program, which hampers communication with target groups in giving assistance in implementing the programs</p> <p>Reluctance of RT head due to the daily busy schedule and intention to retire from the position, undermines his role in giving assistance</p> <p>Assistance from RW and RT head as local leaders is not very useful due to little information related to PPMK in their neighborhoods</p> |

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|
| <p>Training of RW and RT heads and other members on urban management or PPMK management</p> | <p>There is no special training on PPMK management to RW and RT heads and other members. There is only briefing through meetings between facilitators, coordinators, and the community involved in PPMK</p> | <p>Both RW and RT heads have never had training on urban management in relation to PPMK implementation in the village</p> | <p>No training on PPMK management has ever been conducted. 'Training' in limited to initial meetings between the facilitator, the coordinator, as well the target groups in PPMK</p> | <p>There is no tailored training on PPMK management as an empowerment program in urban cities. Only briefings through informal meetings</p> | <p>No specific training given to RW and RT heads as well as other neighborhood staff members related to urban management in general and PPMK management in particular</p> |
|---|---|---|--|---|---|

6

Source: *Data Analysis*

hold neighborhoods (RWs) that went into effect on September 7, 2016. The three regulations are motivated by the desire to create an enabling environment to foster community empowerment by empowering the role and functions of RT/RW in supporting local governance. Specifically, the regulation on RT and RW governance are expected to enhance community participation through supporting the functions of government and service delivery at village levels.

To further, his argument on the importance of community participation in the 21st century, Edwards (2013) underscores the potential of e-governance in improving governance at the small scale level. E-governance according to Nurhadryani (2009) consists of two important elements, namely governance as the underlying concept, and information and communications technology, the latter considered crucial to the former. Current developments in government show increasing use of information technology in the government thanks to higher accessibility and ease of adopting ICT in governance processes. Edwards argues that for more effective community participation, adoption of ICT must be simultaneous and holistic, which averts legacy problems. In his view, Edwards argues that the application of technological developments will continue to influence the culture of the community and the capacity of citizens for the foreseeable future. To that end, the intervention in local governments, especially in villages, is pivotal for sustained community development.

It is apparent that DKI Jakarta administration is cognizant of the importance that ICT will play in both administration and delivery of services in future. This is reflected in the fact that DKI Jakarta has in place an integrated Information and communications technology in the concept of Jakarta Smart City through "Qlue" app. The concept is based on a community reporting system from the villages which can be downloaded free of charge. To enhance public participation, DKI Jakarta provincial Government integrated CROP and Qlue applications into the Smart City portal. This point was emphasized by Head of the Jakarta Smart City implementation agency (UPT), Setiaji, who noted that "We want to enhance transparen-

cy of public information and public service by encouraging all local government agencies (SKPD) in the DKI Jakarta provincial government to publish their data". Nonetheless, attempts to navigate the applications showed that the applications have yet to accommodate expected community empowerment capabilities as an integral part of village development programs.

There is little doubt that the integration of information technology in development programs by DKI Jakarta government such as the case of Jakarta Smart City and "Qlue" app, has created avenues for enhanced public participation. Specifically, the development and adoption of "Qlue" application in public service delivery has increased public interest in accessing government services, and by extension, contributing to higher public participation. This is largely due to the fact that the brand name of the application is renowned, facilitates timely reporting and the continuous feature development that are based on feedback from users (users obtain information on policy updates through emails that also contain information on the latest application development and use of "Qlue" application).

Moreover, adopting the application to serve community empowerment purposes at the village level, is possible through adjusting the features in line with the requirements of administering village development programs. However, the challenge in adopting the application to serve village community development purposes lies in the difficulty of adjusting it to embed socializing features. Besides, to support PPMK development, the government can develop a website which can be used in collecting comprehensive information on programs as well as serving as a reporting mechanism of development activities. It must be noted however that to become an effective medium of public participation in community development programs, the website must be updated to ensure that it provides real time information about activities that are featured in the application as well as is easily accessible to the public (service users).

It has been mentioned earlier that e-governance plays an important role in enhancing public participation in PPMK programs in DKI Jakarta. However, there is

Table 8. Types of Content Indonesian Internet users' access

| Types of Content | Number of Netizens | Percentage |
|------------------|--------------------|------------|
| Social Media | 129.2 million | 97.40% |
| Entertainment | 128.4 million | 96.80% |
| News | 127.9 million | 96.40% |
| Education | 124.4 million | 93.80% |
| Commercial | 123.5 million | 93.10% |
| Public Places | 121.5 million | 91.60% |

Source: Association of the Indonesian Internet Providers and Indonesian Polling, November 2016

need for more efforts to improve on the content and interface of government websites to make them attractive, accessible and interactive for users. Results of a survey of Internet users in Indonesia sponsored by Association of Indonesian Internet Service Providers and implemented by Indonesia Polling agency in 2016 on internet behavior in Indonesia showed that Indonesian internet users more often access social media and entertainment news, with little interest being paid to public service content. This is shown in Table 8.

Based on data in Table 8, it is evident that internet users in Indonesia including those in DKI Jakarta, use internet as a means to have access to entertainment, rather than interact with providers of public services. Survey result also underscore the important role RW and RT heads play in encouraging and mobilizing society in the villages to make use of information and communication technology in implementing PPMK activities.

RT and RW are two public institutions that are stipulated in the Minister of Internal affairs regulation No. 5 / 2007 to play a strategically important role in public service delivery. This is attributable to the fact that the two institutions have direct contact and interaction with the public. Based on gubernatorial regulation No.171 /2016, RT is an institution that is established through local discussion forum as part of public service that is administered by village

head, while RW is also formed through a discussion forum in the community and conducts some of the duties of the village head. The RW head is inaugurated by the village head.

Based on the regulation, functions of RT and RW include the following:

1. Collecting data on population and providing other administrative services;
2. Maintaining security, law and order in the community
3. Proposing ideas on development by facilitating the gathering and dissemination of public aspirations and encouraging self-help activities in the community;
4. Promoting mutual self-help and community participation in the community.

Thus, institutionally, RW and RT serve as a bridge between the village and the community is as far as information and conditions on public policy in the village. Meanwhile, functions of RT and RW heads include:

1. Serving as the driving force in the of implementation of RT and RW tasks;
2. Mediator and a facilitator for the community in relation to the settlement of prob-

lems/disputes using kinship principles;

3. Mediator and facilitator in channeling community aspirations at the village level;
4. Empower community in their area to become independent, develop initiative and participate in community activities toward achieving societal welfare.

Doubtless, the above functions of RT and RW heads strengthen their role as a "bridge" between the village and the community, especially during public service delivery and in community development efforts. Moreover, the structure enables T and RW heads to play a strategically important role in effecting governance at the village level.

As noted by the Secretary to the Administrative City of South Jakarta, in Bina Pemerintahan, in conducting their duties, RT and RW heads are not tied or connected institution wise to other community institutions, rather serve as partners. "No, their relationship is unlike superior-subordinate relationship. On the contrary, they are partners of one another, just ties between LMK and the village head. To that end, LMK is not superior to RT and RW. They are a triad of community self-help institutions in household neighborhoods with respect to community empowerment, administration, development, security and scope of work. It is just like that". The explanation clarifies the position of both RT and RW institutions within the framework of village administration and community institutions. To that end, the notion espoused by some of the informants in villages that were case studies of this research that LMK treats RW and RT subordinates is not true. The reality is that the two village institutions work together with the village head in executing PPMK activities.

Governor regulations that clarify, and strengthen the role and duties of RT and RW in village administration, which DKI Jakarta government implemented are aimed at strengthening their capacity in delivering public services as well as development tasks that support community development. Nonetheless, there is need for the government to

strengthen control over the conduct of their designated functions to ensure that they are in line with regulations. The above observation is based on field work information and results of interview that showed that the functions of RT and RW as institutions and administrators of public services are not running smoothly. This was confirmed in an interview with an official of Tanjung Duren Selatan village who noted that "It would be better to go to RT because members of community here are in the upper middle class and mostly newcomers to the village. If the RT could communicate with them, that would elevate their participation. Nonetheless, while some RT and RW heads are active, others remain passive. Consequently, if there is information that the RW head conveys to RT, the RT may not disseminate such information to community members. Yes never mind. They are newcomers. They don't know most of the issues. Honestly, I consider promoting PPMK quite similar to promoting communal work every Sunday. I always remind the RT head of the need to encourage people to play an active role in the program. I also often remind him that if he is not active, residents of the area will also become less active as well. What must be noted is that most of the residents here are newcomers..."

Based on research results, all the villages that served as case studies had their share of active and passive RT and RW heads, irrespective of whether the villages were categorized as having low or high social vulnerability. To that end, there is need to ensure that RT and RW heads have the capacity and knowledge to conduct their functions and duties.

Program effectiveness largely depends on the existence of effective mechanisms that disseminate relevant information to target groups and the support of RT and RW heads. Specifically, the support of RT and RW head toward community empowerment can be enhanced through making use of information and communication technology in a number of ways that include:

1. Enhance the capacity of RT and RW heads to utilize information and commu-

nication technology;

2. Build communication and partnership with villages and LMK to obtain as much information as possible that relates to communities, which is then disseminated to members of the community;
3. Promote the use of information and communication technology in the community by encouraging community members to download "Qlue" app and make use of communication means (chat room) in the app;
4. Use ITC to create groups that invites all households, LMK members, village heads, and neighborhood officials to become members.

It is worth noting that all the above efforts must receive the support and commitment of RT and RW heads, who must use their leverage to serve as a bridge between community members and LMK and village heads.

Increasing the use of ICT in society requires strong involvement and commitment of the RT and RW heads in such areas as encouraging residents to use and access e-government services, provide short term training on interface and interaction of users with ICT media, and ensuring that ICT information sources have updated and relevant information on issues that are important to users. It is also worth noting, that increased access to technology can be achieved through studying the behavior of users with respect to when, why, what, and how they access information. That way, applications that provide information via technology can be based on users' interests in terms of form, content, design of the interface, and accessibility.

CONCLUSION

The research assesses the level of public participation in community development efforts in selected villages in DKI Jakarta. Results indicate that by and large public participation in community development is low. This is especially so at the planning stage. Factors that are responsible for low public

participation in village governance in DKI Jakarta include participation that is normative (procedural and regulatory) rather than based on requirements and needs of the community; noncompliance with interests of target groups in some areas; lack of information; weak public institutions (village consultative council/LMK), insufficient assistance from RT and RW heads; and lack sufficient technical knowledge on program management. The problem is compounded by low public awareness of conditions in their neighborhoods. Thus, there is need for efforts to enhance the roles of the RT and RW heads in administration and implementation of village functions and duties as they understand and are fully cognizant of aspirations and interests of people who live in their communities.

REFERENCES

- Abdullah, Irwan, Menuju Pembangunan Partisipatif (Bagaimana Mendayagunakan Kebudayaan Lokal?, Jurnal Kebijakan dan Administrasi Publik, Volume 1 Nomor 2 (Juli 1997)
- Academic Report of Village Consultative Agency, DKI Jakarta Province, 2010
- Arstein, S, "A Ladder of Citizen Participation", Journal of American Institute of Planners, 1969
- Bishop, P, and G, Davis, "Mapping Public Participation in Policy Choices", Australian Journal of Public Administration 61 (1), 2002,
- BPS of Administrative City of Central Jakarta, Kecamatan Johar Baru Dalam Angka 2014, Jakarta: BPS of Administrative City of Central Jakarta
- BPS of Administrative City of North Jakarta, Cilincing Dalam Angka 2013, Jakarta: BPS of Administrative City of North Jakarta
- BPS of Administrative City of South Jakarta, Kebayoran Baru Dalam Angka 2014, Jakarta: BPS of Administrative City of South Jakarta
- BPS of Administrative City of West Jakarta, Grogol Petamburan Dalam Angka 2014, Jakarta: BPS of Administrative City of West Jakarta
- BPS of the DKI Jakarta Province, (2014), Indeks Potensi Kerawanan Sosial

- (IPKS) di DKI Jakarta 2013, Official Gazette of Statistics, Jakarta: BPS of the DKI Jakarta Province
- BPS of the DKI Jakarta Province,(2015), Data Strategis DKI Jakarta Maret 2015, Jakarta: BPS of the DKI Jakarta Province
- BPS of the DKI Jakarta Province (2015), Komuter DKI Jakarta Tahun 2014, Official Gazette of Statistics No,12/02/31/Th,XVII, Jakarta: BPS of the DKI Jakarta Province
- Bramson, Ann Ruth, "Involving the Public in Economic Development", *Economic Development Journal*, Summer 2005
- Cunningham, William G., Citizen Participation: Antagonists or Allies, College of Education, Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia, *Journal Theory into Practice*, Volume 15, Issue 4, 1976, Routledge, published 16 Aug 2010
- Denzin, Norman K, dan Yvonna S, Lincoln, *Handbook of Qualitative Research*, Terjemahan, Pustaka Pelajar, Yogyakarta, Cetakan I, 2009
- Edwards, Vickie L., A Theory of Participation for 21st century Governance, *International Journal of Organization Theory and behavior*, 16 (1), 1-28, Spring 2013
- Governor Regulation Number 171 year 2016 concerning the Guidelines of Neighborhood Association (RT) and Community Association (RW)
- Ife, Jim dan Frank Tesoriero, *Community Development, Alternatif Pengembangan Masyarakat di Era Globalisasi*, Edisi Ke-3 Bahasa Indonesia, Pustaka Pelajar, September 2008
- Infographic of the Survey Results 2016 Perilaku Pengguna Internet Indonesia, Association of Indonesian Internet Service Providers and Indonesian Polling, November 2016
- Law Number 23 year 2014 concerning Local Governance, The State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Year 2014 Number 244; Supplement to the State Gazette of the Republic of Indonesia Number 5587
- Nieto, Daniel Ortega M,Sc, "The Effect and Determinants of Local Transparency in Mexico: Who's Accountable?", Georgetown University, April 15, 2010
- United Nation Environment Programme (UNEP)-International Environment Technology Centre (IETC), *Use of ICTs in Community-Based Urban Governance, a view from Japan*, 2003
- Pareek, Nikhil Suresh Democracy, Transparency and Accountability, SSRN (Social Science Research Network) Working Paper Series, February 11, 2012, <http://ssrn.com/abstract=2003389>
- Prasojo, Eko, Prof, Dr., *People and Society Empowerment: Perspektif Membangun Partisipasi Publik*, Resume hasil penelitian dengan Tim Pusat Kajian Strategi Pembangunan sosial dan Politik (PKSPSP) FISIP UI, literature researchentitled "Pola dan Mekanisme Pemberdayaan Masyarakat di DKI Jakarta", 2003
- Srinivas, Hari, 1994, "Community Groups and Planning Action: The Need for Citizen's Participation" Paper presented at the 30th World Congress of ISO-CARP at Prague, Czech Republic, 4-10 September, 1994
- Team Mirah Sakethi, *Program Pemberdayaan Masyarakat Kelurahan Provinsi DKI Jakarta*, Jakarta: Mirah Sakethi, 2010
- Teguh, Ambar Sulistiyani, *Konseptualisasi Model Pemberdayaan LSM Sebagai Fasilitator Pembangunan*, *Jurnal Kebijakan dan Administrasi Publik*, Volume 11 Nomor 2 (November 2007)
- Yani Nurhadryani, "Memahami Konsep E-Governance serta Hubungannya dengan E-Government dan E-Demokrasi", National Seminar on Informatics 2009, UPN "Veteran" Yogyakarta, 23 May 2009
<http://www.infokomputer.com/2015/12/profil/setiaji-merancang-masa-depan-jakarta-smart-city/>, accessed on 3 February 2016