

JURNAL Ekonomika I N D O N E S I A

Pengaruh Pajak Daerah Dan Retribusi Daerah Terhadap Pendapatan Asli Daerah
Setelah Pemekaran Wilayah Kabupaten Bener Meriah
Alwin Teniro & Khairil Anwar

Analisis Kemiskinan Masyarakat Wilayah Pantai Barat, Wilayah Tengah dan
Wilayah Pantai Timur di Provinsi Aceh
Faisal Matriadi

Analisis Pengaruh Jumlah Uang Beredar dan Suku
Bunga Deposito Terhadap Alokasi Dana Kredit Bank Umum di Indonesia
Fikriah & Musrita Dwi

Community Involvement in Urban Infrastructure Development Planning
in Indonesia During The New Order Period
A Review Of Permendagri No. 9/1982
I c h s a n

Analisis Tingkat Kemiskinan di Provinsi Aceh
Jariah Abu Bakar

Analisis Faktor-Faktor Ekonomi dan Sosial yang Mempengaruhi Fertilitas
di Provinsi Aceh
Muhammad Nasir

Evaluasi Kebijakan Pemerintah dalam Peran Sertanya Mengatasi Polusi Udara
di Kota Yogyakarta
Sulistya Rini Pratiwi

Analisis Indeks Pembangunan Manusia Kabupaten Aceh Utara
Yeni Irawan

Analisis Perumusan Visi dan Misi Pembangunan Daerah
Studi Kasus Provinsi Lampung
Y u l B a h r i

Kredit Bank Perkreditan Rakyat dan Pengaruhnya pada
Perkembangan Usaha Mikro Kecil dan Menengah di Kota Banda Aceh
Y u r i n a



Jurusan Ekonomi Pembangunan
FAKULTAS EKONOMI
Universitas Malikussaleh

JURNAL Ekonomika I N D O N E S I A

Pengaruh Pajak Daerah Dan Retribusi Daerah Terhadap Pendapatan Asli Daerah
Setelah Pemekaran Wilayah Kabupaten Bener Meriah
Alwin Teniro & Khairil Anwar

Analisis Kemiskinan Masyarakat Wilayah Pantai Barat, Wilayah Tengah dan
Wilayah Pantai Timur di Provinsi Aceh
Faisal Matriadi

Analisis Pengaruh Jumlah Uang Beredar dan Suku
Bunga Deposito Terhadap Alokasi Dana Kredit Bank Umum di Indonesia
Fikriah & Musrita Dwi

Community Involvement in Urban Infrastructure Development Planning
in Indonesia During The New Order Period
A Review Of Permendagri No. 9/1982
Ichsan

Analisis Tingkat Kemiskinan di Provinsi Aceh
Jariah Abu Bakar

Analisis Faktor-Faktor Ekonomi dan Sosial yang Mempengaruhi Fertilitas
di Provinsi Aceh
Muhammad Nasir

Evaluasi Kebijakan Pemerintah dalam Peran Sertanya Mengatasi Polusi Udara
di Kota Yogyakarta
Sulistya Rini Pratiwi

Analisis Indeks Pembangunan Manusia Kabupaten Aceh Utara
Yeni Irawan

Analisis Perumusan Visi dan Misi Pembangunan Daerah
Studi Kasus Provinsi Lampung
Yul Bahri

Kredit Bank Perkreditan Rakyat dan Pengaruhnya pada
Perkembangan Usaha Mikro Kecil dan Menengah di Kota Banda Aceh
Yurina



**Jurusan Ekonomi Pembangunan
FAKULTAS EKONOMI
Universitas Malikussaleh**

Ekonomika JURNAL INDONESIA

ADVISORY BOARD

Rektor Universitas Malikussaleh
Dekan Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Malikussaleh

EDITORS

Yulbahri (Chief)
Jariah Abu Bakar (Managing Editor)
Damamhur, Khairil Anwar, Hijri Juliansyah, Yurina

REVIEWERS

Apridar, Tarmidi Abbas, Asnawi, Ichhsan
Aliasuddin, Muhammad Nasir, Sabri Abd Madjid

EDITORIAL SECRETARY

Cut Putri Meillitasari, Umaruddin Usman
Munardi, Roslina, Salmi

EDITORIAL OFFICE

Kantor Jurusan Ekonomi Pembangunan
Fakultas Ekonomi Universitas Malikussaleh
Kampus Bukit Indah, Lhokseumawe
Telp/Fax: 0645-41373/44450
Email: ekonomika@fe-unimal.org
<http://www.fe-unimal.org/jurnal/ekonomika>

JURNAL EKONOMIKA INDONESIA

Diterbitkan oleh Jurusan Ekonomi Pembangunan FE-Unimal
Bekerja sama dengan Ikatan Masyarakat Ekonomi Syariah (MES) Cabang Lhokseumawe

Daftar Isi

Pengaruh Pajak Daerah Dan Retribusi Daerah Terhadap Pendapatan Asli Daerah Setelah Pemekaran Wilayah Kabupaten Bener Meriah Alwin Teniro & Khairil Anwar	1
Analisis Kemiskinan Masyarakat Wilayah Pantai Barat, Wilayah Tengah dan Wilayah Pantai Timur di Provinsi Aceh Faisal Matriadi	17
Analisis Pengaruh Jumlah Uang Beredar dan Suku Bunga Deposito Terhadap Alokasi Dana Kredit Bank Umum di Indonesia Fikriah & Musrita Dwi	33
Community Involvement in Urban Infrastructure Development Planning in Indonesia During The New Order Period <i>A Review Of Permendagri No. 9/1982</i> I c h s a n	49
Analisis Tingkat Kemiskinan di Provinsi Aceh Jariah Abu Bakar	61
Analisis Faktor-Faktor Ekonomi dan Sosial yang Mempengaruhi Fertilitas di Provinsi Aceh Muhammad Nasir	73
Evaluasi Kebijakan Pemerintah dalam Peran Sertanya Mengatasi Polusi Udara di Kota Yogyakarta Sulistya Rini Pratiwi	89
Analisis Indeks Pembangunan Manusia Kabupaten Aceh Utara Yeni Irawan	101
Analisis Perumusan Visi dan Misi Pembangunan Daerah <i>Studi Kasus Provinsi Lampung</i> Y u l B a h r i	121
Kredit Bank Perkreditan Rakyat dan Pengaruhnya pada Perkembangan Usaha Mikro Kecil dan Menengah di Kota Banda Aceh Y u r i n a	129

Community Involvement in Urban Infrastructure Development Planning in Indonesia During The New Order Period

A Review Of Permendagri No. 9/1982

Community involvement in urban infrastructure development planning in Indonesia in the New Order (under the Soeharto Administration) was based on the regulation named Permendagri No. 9/1982 (the Regulation No.9 of the Ministry of Home Affairs issued in 1982). The regulation basically became a basis for communities to participate in the urban infrastructure development during that period. This paper addresses several questions concerning the design of Permendagri No.9/1982. How can regulation and community participation principles be linked in such provisions? What is the actual extent of community participation required in the regulation? This study finds that the provisions of community participation in the Permendagri No.9/1982 did not give a chance for the community to have determinant power in urban infrastructure development planning. The participation representative model used in the regulation can be deemed appropriate due to technical capability issues of infrastructure development planning and the fact that Indonesia had strong paternalistic culture during that period. However, the model did not enable the community's aspirations and needs to be considered properly due to the absence of the elected leaders (heads of the Neighborhood Unit) in the decision-making process.

Keywords: *Community involvement, urban infrastructure, regulations.*

I c h s a n

*Dosen pada Fakultas Ekonomi
Universitas Malikussaleh,
Lhokseumawe*

INTRODUCTION

Community involvement in urban infrastructure development planning in Indonesia under the New Order Period (under the Soeharto Administration) was based on the regulation named *Permendagri No. 9/1982* (the Regulation No.9 of the Ministry of Home Affairs issued in 1982). The New Order Regime claimed that this regulation contains the development planning procedure which accommodates community participation principles. The regulation basically became a basis for communities to participate in the urban infrastructure development under the Soeharto Administration (Tim Koordinasi Pembangunan Perkotaan, 1987).

This paper will address several questions concerning the design of *Permendagri No.9/1982*. How can regulation and community participation principles be linked in such provisions? What is the actual extent of community participation required in the regulation?

To answer these questions, this study will begin with a critical assessment of community involvement theories in the context of development projects. Since most of the theories are derived from political and institutional contexts outside Indonesia, I will address some of the modifications that may need to be made to make this analysis meaningful for the environment in which it is to be applied. I will then analyze the main participatory provisions included in the *Permendagri No.9/1982* and show how their application will or will not lead to participation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Definition and Extent of Community Participation

To define community participation precisely is not an easy task. Various social, economic, educational, and additional conditions within communities impact community participation. The varying

degrees and types of involvement in development activities also contribute to the difficulty of defining "community participation." In participatory development literatures, "community involvement," "popular participation," "self-help," and "self reliance" are often considered to have the same meaning as community participation (Whyte, 1986).

In simple terms, Whyte (1986) defines community participation as "the involvement of the community members in development project" (p. 7). The involvement here includes a series of activities: assessment of the situation, definition of the problems, setting of priorities, making decisions, planning of action programs to overcome the problems, sharing responsibility in project implementation, and evaluating and modifying the project. Whyte considers the involvement of the community members as an important element in the community participation's concept without determining the degree of the involvement. It means that as long as the community is involved in the development project, though at the minimum level, it still can be categorized as community participation.

Ng'ayu (1997) refers to community participation as a situation in which society members take an active part in the affairs of their area in terms of decision-making, planning, and the implementation of societal aspirations. Despite providing various scopes of the community involvement as Whyte does, Ng'ayu is not clear about what she means by "take an active part." What is the difference between active and inactive and how can we measure the degree of activeness in this regard? She seems to underline the important role community members should take to deal with their issues (i.e. through an active participation), but she does not elaborate further.

Arnstein (1969) in her classic writing on "A Ladder of Citizen Participation," argues that citizen participation is a categorical term for citizen power which she refers to

as “the redistribution of power that enables the have-not citizens, presently excluded from the political and economic processes, to be deliberately included in the future” (p. 2). Arnstein avoids using terms such as “self-help” or “citizen involvement” when alluding to citizen participation. By using the former terms, she argues that community participation tends to play a limited role in the social transformation process. Regarding the scope of community participation, Arnstein does not state explicitly. However, based on her analysis of participation practice in several areas in the US, the scope of participation covers the entire development process, from the problem identification to the evaluation stages.

Arnstein (1969) classifies community participation into three categories: non participation, tokenism, and citizen power -- based on the degree of power which citizens enjoy in decision making process. These categories are formulated as “eight rungs on a ladder of citizen participation.” The classification is based on the American context and its experiences. According to her, in a hierarchal form, community participation categories from the lowest (the least meaningful) to the highest (the most meaningful) are as follows:

1. Nonparticipation

In this category, community members are not allowed to participate in planning or conducting programs. Power holders ignore the involvement of community in the development process. This category has two levels (from the lowest to the highest):

a. Manipulation

The social elite are placed in the advisory boards of development programs aimed at engineering the community’s support. At meetings, the officials persuade and advise the citizens, and not the reverse.

b. Therapy

The authority tries to be the savior by “curing” the “diseases” suffered by

the community. For example, tenants of public housing are used for the sake of the authority’s interest, such as through promoting cleanup campaigns. On the other side, they do not have a chance to deal with their urgent problems, such as arbitrary eviction or poor maintenance. The fact is that it actually does not solve their real problems because it doesn’t touch on the basic underlying factors causing the problems.

2. Tokenism

This category introduces the initial steps toward legitimate citizen participation through the involvement of the community in decision-making. Unfortunately, this involvement doesn’t guarantee their concerns will truly be taken into account. The levels of community participation in this category (from the lowest to highest) are as follows:

a. Informing

Citizens are informed of their rights, responsibilities, and options. Unfortunately the information is usually provided at a late stage and using a one-way flow of information (from officials to citizens), so citizens can’t influence the decision significantly.

b. Consultation

The community is invited to contribute ideas or considerations for the programs through surveys, neighborhood meetings, or public hearings. Participation is gauged by questionnaire responses, number of meetings/public hearings, or number of people attending the meetings/public hearings. The drawback is that there is no guarantee that their input will be really considered by the officials.

c. Placation

The officials invite the community to provide input for programs and accommodate the involvement of community through the existence of their representatives in related planning boards. However, the right to accept or reject the advice still depends on them.

3. Citizen power

In this category, the community has a determinant power to force and influence the decision-making. A degree of citizen power can be achieved if the citizens have mechanisms in place which will hold their leaders accountable. This category has three levels. From the lowest to highest levels are as follows:

a. Partnership

The power of community is gained through negotiation. Power holders share planning and decision-making responsibilities through joint policy boards, planning committees, or other mechanisms of problem resolution.

b. Delegated power

Citizens can have dominant decision-making authority with regards to a certain program or plan as a result of negotiation with public officials. One of the models at this level is the implementation of the rights of citizens to veto decisions.

c. Citizen Control

This highest level of community participation enables citizens to govern a program, to handle managerial aspects, and to negotiate to change the conditions. In practice, in the American context, many people consider that no model city can meet the criteria of citizen control because the final power and accountability are held by the city council.

Like Arnstein, another scholar, Johnson (1984), also divides citizen participation in urban planning in the light of the degree of involvement and power that citizens have in the decision making process. Johnson classifies community participation level into what he calls "5 forms of participation." In reality, these forms often blend with each other.

1. Constituent participation

This form appears when the planning choices made by the elected officials reflect their constituents' aspirations and needs. Surely this form is possible

to be implemented if citizens have an opportunity to directly choose their officials or leaders.

2. Consultative participation

This second form acknowledges the citizens' right to get information as well as to deliver comments, options and recommendation on the planning. To realize the right, the planning authorities need to implement meetings or hearings.

3. Definitive Participation

This is a distinct form of citizen participation. Here, citizens have legal authority to impose requirements, grant permission, and commit resources. The three top levels (degree of citizen power) of Arnstein's ladder of citizen participation regarding partnership, delegated power, and citizen control levels strongly reflect this form.

4. Implementative participation

In implementing the planning decisions, the involvement of citizens becomes a significant part. In this case, the citizens' choices can be various: cooperate with, abstain from, or oppose the implementation.

5. Evaluative participation

This form is implemented after the planned project has been completed. The citizens who are interested and have direct relation to the project decide whether the outcomes meet their needs and interests. This form of participation is worthwhile in order to give feedback for the implementation of constituent participation. For instance, the failure of a particular project can result in the rejection of similar projects.

Referring to the extent and the forms of community participation formulated by Arnstein and Johnson above, we can also conclude that the involvement of the community in the development planning process can be divided into two general models, i.e., representative participation and direct participation models. In the first

model, community members represented by bureaucrats or community leaders formulate decisions to fulfill community aspirations and needs. The second model is implemented by allowing community members to directly voice their concerns through public hearings.

Participation in Infrastructure Development: the Importance and Challenges of Participation

Rukmana, Hoff, and Steinberg (1993) state that besides being a manifestation of people's rights appreciation, community participation in infrastructure development planning relates to effectiveness and efficiency concerns. They argue that these effectiveness and efficiency concerns rely on the following premises:

1. Community participation contributes to achieving the best use of limited resources (money, material, knowledge, and skills) for the benefit of as many people as possible, which is for, the community at large, not of certain exclusive groups.
2. Community participation creates a possibility for decisions to be based on the community's needs, priorities and affordability. This may result in better and more realistic designs, plans, programs, and policies. In addition, it may increase the chance that community members are willing to contribute their resources such as money and labor towards implementation, operation, and maintenance due to the increased sense of belonging of the community.
3. Community participation ensures that the community's knowledge, creativity, and skills are recognized and used. This may also result in better and more realistic designs, plans, programs, and policies.
4. Community participation ensures a greater acceptance and appreciation of developing infrastructure. This may result in better care, better maintenance, and increased pride.
5. Community participation builds up

the self enabling and cooperative spirit of the community. It will enhance the community's self reliance, which in turn will decrease the need for government resource involvement.

Rukmana, Hoff, and Steinberg underline that efficiency and effectiveness should not only be visible and measurable (money, land, labor, etc), but also invisible and immeasurable. An example of such invisible resources is the enhancement of a community's capacity building in terms of knowledge, creativity, skills, and organization. Moreover, if there is no opportunity for community members to contribute these invisible resources, they tend to lose motivation, willingness, and enthusiasm to contribute the other visible measurable resources.

Despite its significant benefits in the abstract, participation in infrastructure development poses certain challenges for community decision makers. According to Cogan, Sharpe, and Hertzberg (1986), citizen participation in infrastructure development planning will naturally vary for different activities and governmental levels. In terms of activities, due to technical capability issues, citizen participation is most effective in the stages of goal formulation and policy definition and tends to be limited in other stages. In this case, the planners' roles will then be much more dominant. Cogan et. al. consider that citizen participation in infrastructure development planning should cover a broad scope, i.e. goal setting, policy identification and analysis, policy making, administrative rulemaking, program operations, and evaluation. With regard to governmental levels, citizens become easily involved at the local level decisions because they are close to their concerns which are readily understood. On the other hand, issues at the state and regional levels tend to be more abstract and far from their daily life.

Moreover, Cogan et. al. argue that the

limitation of community participation should also be considered in light of the nature of community participation itself: on one hand, public involvement is often a requirement for the government; on the other, it is optional for the citizens. According to the authors, even though community members tend to be reluctant to participate in the development process, it does not mean that they have no motivation to be involved in such a process. As a matter of fact, they have various motivations. They choose to participate probably because they expect a satisfying experience and hope to be able to make a difference. With regards to a well-planned program, the expectations of community members and the government are similar.

Hoff and Steinberg (1992) contend that the limited role of the community in the infrastructure development planning relates to the readiness of both government and communities. On the one hand, government bureaucrats and agencies should have political will and the skill to stimulate and broaden participatory process. On the other hand, community members themselves should have eagerness and ability to participate in the process.

Other obstacles of community participation in the infrastructure development planning, to some extent, seem to be relatively the same as those in other development types. Overall, community members' decision to be involved in the development process is greatly influenced by the benefits and experience which they will gain from the process itself. According to Snel (in Hanafie, 1999), constraints on community participation in general development activities are caused by two factors. First, it is likely that community participation is considered an unfair distribution of work among members of community. Some community members probably feel that they are asked to take on extra work tasks that provide them little financial, social, or other incentives. Second, the usual positions

of people tend to be individualistic. Dealing with this, it is difficult to involve people with affairs that are not directly related to their lives and interests.

Given the facts mentioned above, it can be concluded that constraints on community participation in infrastructure development planning come from the government as well as the community. The roles of both these groups and their cooperation determine the success of community participation in the infrastructure development planning process. In general, more meaningful community participation in the infrastructure development planning process requires political will and the skills of government bureaucrats and government agencies to stimulate the participatory process as well as the awareness and abilities of community members to participate in the process.

Specifically, to deal with technical capability constraints involving the community in infrastructure development planning, the representative participation model offered by Johnson can be taken into account. For the sake of effectiveness, community members can be represented by officials or leaders who are familiar with infrastructure development issues. It is important to note that –as suggested by Johnson-- this model requires representatives who are directly elected by the community so that the community's aspirations and needs can be properly channeled in the decision making process.

Community Participation in *Permendagri No. 9/1982*

The provisions of community participation in *Permendagri No 9/1982* were explained in the *Pedoman Penyusunan Perencanaan dan Pengendalian Pembangunan (P5D or Guidelines for the Formulation, Planning and Control of Regional Development)*. The provisions contained the development planning procedure, including the urban infrastructure sector (Tim Koordinasi Pembangunan Perkotaan, 1987).

It was mentioned in the regulation that the *Lurah* (the Head of Village) and Village Development Council (*LKMD*) which consisted of *Ketua RW* (Heads of Groups of Neighborhood Units) represented the community to formulate the development program for their village through *Musyawarah Pembangunan Tingkat Desa* (*Musbangdes* or Village Level Deliberations on Development Affairs). Then the results of *The Village Level Deliberation on Development Affairs* were processed at higher levels: *Temu Karya* (Coordinated Meetings on Development Affairs at the Sub District Level), *Rakorbang II* (Coordinated Meetings on Development Affairs at the District Level), *Rakorbang I* (Coordinated Meetings on Development Affairs at the Provincial Level) and *Rakornas* (National Coordinating Meetings).

As a matter of fact, formally, according to the decision-making process in Indonesia under the Soeharto Administration, there were two lower levels under the Village Level Deliberation for Development Affairs that were not embodied in the regulation. They are *Musyawarah Tingkat RW* (the Groups of Neighborhoods Level Deliberation on Development Affairs) and *Musyawarah Tingkat RT* (the Neighborhood Level Deliberation on Development Affairs).

Community participation arranged in the regulation was only for the annual development planning process derived from *Program Jangka Menengah (PJM* or the Five-Year Investment Program) prepared by the District Government (*Tim Koordinasi Pembangunan Perkotaan, 1987*). It means that this annual planning should comply with and adjust to the the Five-Year Investment Program formulated beforehand without the involvement of community's representatives.

Analysis Of The Provisions Of Community Participation In *Permendagri No.9/1982*

In analyzing the provisions of community participation in *Permendagri No.9/1982*, this

paper will use several concepts discussed earlier in the literature review. To examine the community participation principles in the regulation, it will accommodate concepts of Arnstein, Johnson and Rukmana et., al., as related to definition, models, and principles of community participation. For the scope and specific characteristics of the participation in the context of infrastructure development planning, it will employ concepts of Cogan, Sharpe, and Hertzberg. To determine the extent of community participation in the regulation, it will adopt "Arstein's ladder of citizen participation" as the benchmark.

Arstein's definition on community participation put citizens, particularly the have-not citizens, as the main actors possessing significant power within the development process. Their roles are not symbolic but influence the decision making process. This definition is appropriate as the parameter because its spirit is in line with this paper's position: supporting the interest of the community that in the Indonesian context is mostly composed of the have-not citizens. Using this definition means we believe that community members should have a determinant power to force and affect the decision making. In other words, they should have significant bargaining power when struggling for their aspirations and needs for their future life.

With regard to Arnstein's and Johnson's analysis, there can also be drawn two general models of participation: representative participation and direct participation models. The first model provides a chance for community members to participate in the decision making process through their representative, i.e. bureaucrats or community exponents such as informal leaders. The second model allows community members to directly voice their concerns and aspirations.

Premises of the importance of community participation in infrastructure development planning described by Rukmana, Hoff, and Steindberg can be used as principles

that should be the soul of community participation practice. They include the following:

1. The best use of financial resources for the benefit of the community at large.
2. Supporting the possibility for decisions to be based on the community's needs, priorities, and affordability.
3. Ensuring that the community's knowledge, creativity, and skills are used.
4. Acceptance and appreciation of developed infrastructure by the community.
5. Building up the self-enabling and cooperative spirit of the community.

The scope of the citizen participation in the infrastructure development planning, as suggested by Cogan, Sharpe, and Hertzberg, should be comprehensive and holistic, covering a series of actions which include goal setting, policy identification and analysis, policy making, administrative rulemaking, program operations, and evaluation.

In terms of the extent of community participation, "Arstein's ladder of citizen participation" is considered applicable due to its flexibility and practicality. In a way, despite using the American context as the basis of her analysis, it seems that this approach can be applied in the different settings. To classify and differentiate each participation level, she uses the degree of community's power in decision making process which in general can be classified into three categories, i.e. "no power" (non participation), "superficial power" (tokenism), and "real power" (citizen power). She does not consider techniques and mediums of participation as the parameters in determining the level of participation which obviously vary among countries or localities. The main concern is to examine how much power citizens exercise regardless of how and in what arenas they gain the power. Due to this general approach, we believe "Arstein's ladder of citizen participation" is also applicable in analyzing the extent of community participation

within the Indonesian context as well as in the infrastructure sector.

Analysis of the Provisions

Community participation promoted in *Permendagri No.9/1982* did not position community members as main actors in the infrastructure development planning. Instead of redistributing power between government and the community in exercising community participation as suggested by Arnstein's concepts, the regulation seems to go through the empty ritual of participation. The regulation did not enable the community to have strong bargaining power in the infrastructure development planning process. Analyses related to the model, scope, and extent (level) of participation in the regulation will elaborate this argument, as seen below.

In terms of participation models, the implementation of community participation arranged in the regulation was set in an indirect model. It is highlighted by the fact that the involvement of the community in the development planning process in this regulation was implemented through representation. In this case, the community was represented by the head of the Village and heads of Groups of Neighborhood Units at the lowest level of the development planning process of this regulation, i.e. the Village Level Deliberation on Development Affairs. According to Johnson, even though the representative model hierarchically is lower than the direct participation model, it has a chance to accommodate community members' needs and aspirations as long as the community directly chooses the officials or leaders representing them.

Unfortunately, the regulation did not involve elected leaders (heads of the Neighborhood Unit) in the Village Level Deliberation on Development Affairs. Here the Village Level Deliberation on Development Affairs only involved the head of the Village and heads of the Group of Neighborhood Units. Basically, the head

of the Neighborhood Unit was the lowest-level formal leader who was directly elected by the community. Therefore he/she had a very close relationship with the community. Head of Village (*Lurah*) was a government appointed leader. Although the head of the Group of Neighborhood Units was chosen by various heads of Neighborhood Units, the power of head of the Village to intervene in the election process was very dominant. The implication of this fact was that there was no guarantee that grassroots' aspirations could be truly accommodated because their "real" and only elected leader (head of Neighborhood Unit) was jurisdictionally not involved in the decision-making process in the regulation.

Due to its strong relationship with the *Permendagri No.9/1982*, we also have to pay attention to the preparation of the Five-Year Investment Program (*Program Jangka Menengah=PJM*). This document, as explained earlier was the reference for the annual urban infrastructure development planning. Like the annual urban infrastructure development planning, this document preparation did not involve elected leaders (head of the Neighborhood Unit). Even heads of the Sub District, Heads of Villages and Heads of Groups of Neighborhood Units, and two upper-level positions above head of the Neighborhood Unit were not engaged in the preparation. The participants of this document preparation were bureaucrats at the district government level. This fact put community representatives in a "fait accompli" position: they had to comply with policies and other guidance in the document when formulating the annual urban infrastructure development planning.

The absence of elected leaders in the participatory process mentioned above in turn, did not give enough space for the existence of Rukmana et. al. participation principles. The most important principle, the best use of financial resources for the benefit of the community, for instance, was difficult to achieve since the appointed leaders

representing the community tended not to have strong commitment to the community. Their concern was how to show good performance from their superiors' perspective that in some cases was not necessarily in line with the community's needs, wishes, and priorities. Such commitment would then not give incentives for these leaders to utilize the community's knowledge, creativity, and skills in the planning process. Furthermore, it was eventually not conducive to build community capacity and create community's acceptance on the infrastructure development products.

From the participation scope standpoint, the regulation only accommodated participatory process for program propositions. It did not arrange community involvement in other stages, i.e. goal setting, policy identification and analysis, policy making, administrative rulemaking, program operations, and evaluation as the complete parts of the infrastructure development planning concept formulated by Cogan et., al. In the context of Indonesia in the New Order Regime, this participation scope was critical because this was the only regulation used as guidance in executing community participation in urban infrastructure development planning. It would not become a serious concern unless other stages of participation other than program proposition were integrated into other regulations.

According to Arnstein's levels of community participation, community participation provisions in the regulation can be placed in the middle rung of the ladder of citizen participation, i.e. tokenism (see table 2). To some extent, the values of community participation in the regulation are at the "informing" stage because the process of the lowest decision making in the regulation (the Village Level Deliberation on Development Affairs) was initiated by delivering information about the development agenda from the head of the Village to the heads of Groups of Neighborhood Units. The participation can

also be placed at the “consultation” rung because in every stage of the decision-making process in the regulation, the community representatives were invited to contribute ideas or input. Meanwhile, this participation can be considered “placation” because of the involvement of community’s representatives in contributing input in the entire hierarchy of decision-making process.

However, the rules in the regulation could not promote citizen power. This is because tokenism was still strongly apparent in the rules. This premise is supported by the absence of *Ketua RT* (the head of the Neighborhood Unit), the lowest formal leader who was directly elected by the community at the Village Level Deliberation on Development Affairs. Consequently, there was no assurance that citizen concerns and ideas will be taken into account at the Village Level Deliberation on Development Affairs. Meanwhile community members themselves did not have an opportunity to voice comments, concerns, and input directly in the decision making process.

CONCLUSIONS

In conclusion, from the community point of view, the provisions of community participation in the *Permendagri No.9/1982* have some flaws because they did not support community participation in a meaningful way. The provisions did not give a chance for the community to have determinant

power in urban infrastructure development planning. To some extent, the participation representative model used can be deemed appropriate due to technical capability issues of infrastructure development planning and the fact that Indonesia still had strong paternalistic culture under the New Order Period. However, the model did not enable the community’s aspirations and needs to be considered properly due to the absence of the elected leaders (heads of the Neighborhood Unit) in the decision-making process.

This model, in turn, was more likely to oppose basic principles of community participation in infrastructure development planning including the benefit for the community, accommodating the community’s needs and aspirations, using community’s knowledge, creativity, and skills, community acceptance of the infrastructure development product, and supporting community capacity building. In terms of scope of participation, the coverage of participation in the regulation was also very narrow (only in the program formulation stage) excluding other stages such as implementation and evaluation. It becomes a serious concern due to the fact that in the New Order Regime Indonesia only had this regulation for executing community participation in urban infrastructure development planning.

According to Arnstein’s ladder of citizen participation, it is obvious that the regulation only offered citizen participation

Table 1
“Rungs” of citizen participation in *Permendagri No.9/1982*
according to Arnstein’s framework

Rung	Rungs of Citizen Participation	Degree	Concept	Remarks
1 2	Manipulation Therapy	Non Participation	People don't participate, the rulers “educate” and “cure” people	
3 4 5	Informing Consultation Placation	Tokenism	Community is involved in decision- making, but there is no guarantee their concerns will be taken into account	Community participation in Permendagri No.9/1982
6 7 8	Partnership Delegated Power Citizen Control	Citizen Power	Community has the power to “force” and influence decisions	

in the medium achievement level (degrees of tokenism). This means that the involvement of citizens in the urban infrastructure development planning process through the placement of their representative in the planning committee tended to be superficial and artificial. The reason is because that kind of involvement did not guarantee that citizens' aspirations, demands, and needs were taken into account by the related authority.

REFERENCES

- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). *A Ladder of Citizen Participation*, [http:// Lithgow-schmidt.dk/sherry-arnstein/ladder-of-citizen-participation.html](http://Lithgow-schmidt.dk/sherry-arnstein/ladder-of-citizen-participation.html)
- Cogan, A., Sharpe, S., Hertzberg, J. (1986). In So, F. S., Hand, I. and McDowell, B.D. (eds), *The Practice of State and Regional Planning* (pp. 283-304). Chicago: American Planning Association.
- Hoff, R. V. D. and Steinberg, F. (1992). *Innovative Approaches to Urban Development*. Rotterdam: Institute for Housing and Urban Development Studies.
- Johnson, W. C. (1984). Citizen participation in local planning: a comparison of US and British experiences, *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy*, 2, 1-14.
- Ng'ayu, Margaret. 1997. Community Participation and Local Development, <http://www.Melissa.org/english/kenya97.htm>.
- Rukmana, N., Steinberg, F., and Hoff, R. V. D. (1993). *Urban infrastructure development management*. Jakarta: PT Pustaka LP3ES Indonesia.
- Snell, M. (1999). In Hanafie, J. *Community Participation in the Urban Life*. Jakarta: Kantor Menperkim.
- Tim Koordinasi Pembangunan Perkotaan. (1987). *Policies for urban development in Indonesia*. Jakarta: Sekretariat Tim Koordinasi Pembangunan Perkotaan.
- Whyte, A. (1986). *Guidelines for Planning Community Participation Activities in Water Supply and Sanitation Projects*. Switzerland: World Health Organization.