Community Driven Development In Traditional Communities In Papua

Yannice Luma Marnala Sitorus[1]

Abstract. *Community-Driven Development is a social planning concept aimed at changing the behaviour and attitude of marginalized communities in other to empower them. This means with their own ability they can collectively solve social and economic problems in their environment. By using various participatory approaches, that are considered most suitable in the postmodern planning era, this development concept is expected to increase the welfare of underprivileged communities. This concept is also applied in the development of traditional communities, especially for customary tradition communities, but has not yet had a significant impact. This study uses existing literature to show the general results of community-driven development in traditional communities, especially traditional communities in Papua. Many development programmes were run by the government using participatory approaches. The study shows that the desired social change is not yet observed for traditional communities in Papua, who have obtained community-driven development programmes for so many years. These communities still have the lowest level of welfare in Indonesia. The social learning that was expected to happen in any community-driven development program with participatory approaches happens very slowly in Papua.*

Keywords. *community empowerment, traditional communities, social change*

Abstrak. *Pembangunan berbasis pemberdayaan masyarakat sebenarnya merupakan suatu konsep perencanaan sosial yang bertujuan untuk mengubah perilaku dan sikap sosial masyarakat yang termarjinalkan agar dapat menjadi lebih berdaya, yang artinya dengan kemampuannya sendiri secara bersama-sama dapat menyelesaikan masalah-masalah sosial dan ekonomi di lingkungannya. Dengan menggunakan berbagai pendekatan partisipatif, yang dianggap paling sesuai pada era 'postmodern planning' ini, konsep pembangunan tersebut diharapkan dapat meningkatkan kesejahteraan masyarakat yang berada pada level bawah. Konsep ini juga diterapkan dalam pembangunan masyarakat tradisional, khususnya komunitas adat, tetapi belum memberikan dampak yang berarti. Kajian ini menggunakan literatur yang ada untuk menunjukkan bagaimana hasil pembangunan berbasis pemberdayaan masyarakat secara umum pada komunitas adat, khususnya komunitas adat di Papua. Program-program pembangunan tersebut banyak dijalankan oleh pihak pemerintah dengan menggunakan pendekatan-pendekatan partisipatif. Hasil kajian menunjukkan bahwa perubahan sosial yang diinginkan ini belum terlihat pada komunitas adat di Papua yang telah sekian tahun memperoleh program-program pembangunan berbasis masyarakat. Komunitas tersebut masih memiliki tingkat kesejahteraan terendah di Indonesia. Pembelajaran sosial yang diharapkan dapat terjadi dalam setiap program pembangunan berbasis pemberdayaan masyarakat dengan pendekatan partisipatif berjalan sangat lambat di Papua.*

Kata kunci. *pemberdayaan masyarakat, komunitas adat, perubahan sosial*

---

[1] University of Science and Technology Jayapura, Indonesia, nala_ustj2006@yahoo.co.id

Introduction

One group of people often marginalized in developments are traditional societies, particularly traditional communities. These groups have much lower levels of welfare compared to other groups in society. This happens not only in developing countries but also in developed countries. Traditional communities such as Native American tribes in the United States and Aborigines in Australia have relatively lower levels of welfare compared with other communities. The same situation also occurs for traditional communities in Indonesia, especially for traditional communities in Papua.

Since the enactment of special autonomy in 2001, Papua has greater authority to regulate the government and development in their own region. In 2007, the Governor of Papua, Barnabas Suebu, launched the strategic village development plan RESPEK which aims to empower indigenous inhabitants of Papua, the majority of which live in villages. In 2008, with help from the central government that provided facilitators to accompany communities in development efforts, the program started. It was then known by the name PNPM (National Program for Community Empowerment) RESPEK. This program has reached about 87% of the villages (4000 villages) in Papua and West Papua (Sari et.al. 2011). However, development, that has run for some time in Papua, so far has not yet been able to improve the welfare of the indigenous inhabitants, or traditional communities in the villages. The Human Development Index (HDI) of the province of Papua, where the majority consists of indigenous inhabitants of Papua, is still the lowest throughout 2009-2013 when compared to other provinces in Indonesia. Besides this, the proportion of villages lagging behind in Papua has not changed much between 2011 (89.5%) and 2014 (91.06%) (Ministry of National Development Planning/BAPPENAS, 2015). The social learning process that was expected to take place through the implementation of the community-based development program occurs very slowly in Papuan traditional communities so at this moment it does not yet make a significant impact.

The fact that the traditional communities still have not been empowered after the implementation of community-driven development programs, a development concept currently considered most desirable, shows how slow the process of social learning in traditional communities is, in part because critical awareness has not yet developed in these societies. According to Freire, groups of people are marginalized due to the lack of critical awareness in their community. Mankind must deal with the world and with reality with a fully critical and creative attitude, should be able to cope with situations that constrain them, not surrender or give up to these limiting situations, be in control of themselves and because of that, it is human nature to be free and independent. Changes in awareness to become critical can be seen from changes in the social and cultural structures of society (Freire, 2007). According to Friedmann, the process of social learning emphasized by dialogue and mutual relations between individuals combines two kinds of knowledge, namely personal knowledge and theoretical knowledge. Personal knowledge is knowledge of everyday life which humans often unconsciously have. The process of adopting personal knowledge from processed knowledge is called reciprocal learning because it involves people with different abilities and skills to work together in solving problems (Friedmann, 1981). Reciprocal learning is practiced in community-driven development with a participatory approach but apparently has not yet succeeded in accelerating the process of social learning in traditional communities in Papua. With this participatory approach, members of the community were involved, as can be seen from various methods used in the approach, such as among others: implementation of a group method, in which members of the community were involved and learn for instance how to identify problems and make presentations with the facilitator. Another approach is the sampling method, in which members

of the communities are trained in among other things, to explore the area while making observations together with the facilitator, are involved in interviews and dialogue in such things as mapping problems and history of the region. Last is the application of a diagrams and visualizations method that trains members of the community in explaining the results of their observations, for example, and to facilitate the acceptance of such information by other community members (Pretty, 1995, and Chambers, 2001).

The use of participatory approaches in community-driven development gives communities the opportunity for development based on their own abilities, one of which is the use of the cultural capital they have. Placing culture in public planning is an important part of the efforts to achieve sustainable development (Throsby, 2001). Culture is an important capital in the development of society and the use of local cultural capital can accelerate the social learning process in regional development and each of the people-centered development programs for traditional communities has to first put emphasis on local cultural understanding. Some studies directed at traditional communities tend to be oriented on the concept of European/western culture. Therefore, understanding of the traditional communities has to be reflected in advance, because if not, this will lead to their repression because their basic rights have been ignored (Hart, 2010; Vallance, 2011). One example can be seen from a case of landslides in the central highlands of Papua Province. This happened after an agricultural expert from Europe felt apprehensive about the farming technology of the local traditional communities which cultivate land for sweet potatoes vertically on a mountainside because according to modern or Western science, this will cause a high level of erosion. This led to the local communities to be taught to cultivate the land according to its contour in a horizontal direction. However, this particular area of land was washed away during heavy rain which usually happens in that region, with the losses incurred by the local community as a result of listening to the advice of the expert (Diamond, 2015). However, the use of cultural capital in development is not easy to put to practice because culture, or the personal knowledge of traditional communities, is often not yet adopted in modern knowledge (development). The ones who know most about their cultural capital are the traditional communities themselves, but when their critical awareness has not yet grown there will not be a process of adopting their cultural capital into development.

This study aims to describe the results of community-driven development which was generally carried out in traditional communities in Papua. The study was conducted with a qualitative approach using a descriptive analysis method based on a literature review and secondary data obtained from various references. The following part of this paper consists of a literature review, which describes the understanding of the concept of community-driven development following a participatory approach as a development strategy, and an understanding of social change that occurs in traditional communities. The paper will then present the results of community driven development undertaken in Papua, especially those carried out through the RESPEK program, and finally the conclusion.

Literature Review

Community-Driven Development

The concept of community-driven development is an expansion of the concept of people-centered development which emerged as a response to the development approach based on economic growth. In the 19th century (the age of industrialization), the existing concept of development was oriented at maximum production (economic growth). This concept does not give people welfare but instead widens economic disparities between them, particularly in

countries that are developing. The expected trickle-down effect from the centers of economic growth to their surrounding areas did not happen. What occurred instead is welfare inequality between economic growth centers and fringe areas. At that time, development planning adopted a top-down system, dominated by the authority, where the capacity and capability of the public in decision-making is restricted.

Preceded by the thinking of David C. Korten who stated that people-centered development is about seeing community's creative initiatives as the main development resource and considering the mental and spiritual welfare of societies as the goal to be achieved by the development process. This development concept then grew to fill in the gaps where the market failed to fulfill the people's social needs and political institutions and the government also failed to carry out their mandate in meeting the basic needs of all their citizens. This community-based perspective gained legitimacy with a World Bank publication in 1974, which recommends rural development strategies to be focused on improving access for small farmers and workers of land owners to water, credit markets and other facilities, which can increase their productivity. Further, the characteristics of both paradigms of development, as mentioned earlier can be seen more clearly in Table 1.

Table 1. Two Development Paradigms

Dimension	Production-Centered	Community-Centered
Logic	Production economy (exploitation and manipulation of natural resources).	Balanced human ecology.
Aim	Growth in the flow of goods and services (increase in the number and quality of goods & services).	Human development (strengthening of human potential).
Economic system	Conventional (large-scale, specialization, investment, comparative advantage, global interdependence).	System of self-organization (local scale, human ecology system, territorial interdependence).
Bureaucracy	Large bureaucracy (the communities are organized in an efficient system of production with centralized supervision).	Self-organization system (human-scale organizational units and self-organizing communities).
Criteria	Paying attention to the needs of the production system (efficiency, maximizing the rate of growth in productivity of the system).	Paying attention to the needs of the community (value of products, participation and the quality of work life).
Social engineering	Formal structure, command-style form of organization; decision analysis methods are value-free and positivistic; knowledge is developed based on a functional perspective; the production system is functionally defined; analysis does not take into account human beings and the environment.	Informal, non-governmental organizational form; the role of individuals in the decision-making process with humane values as measurement; knowledge is developed based on a territorial perspective; production and achievements choices are based on an ecological framework, which involves humans and uses them as part of the analysis process.
Decision-making process	Centralized; dominated by experts (technocrats); non-consultative; controls by officials who do not feel the consequences of their decisions.	Decentralization; the people have the right to enter values of local needs in the process of decision-making; controls by the people whose lives are affected by those decisions.

Source: Korten & Sjahrir (1988)

The main characteristics of the concept of community-driven development are as follows (Soleh, 2014):

1. Emphasis on locality both in terms of the institutions, communities, environment and culture.
2. Implications for transformative and transactive planning, bottom-up, community empowerment and participative.

The concept of community-driven development is a form of social planning aimed at making planned social change, namely to change people's attitudes and social behavior to be empowered or able to develop their environment with their own collective efforts. Various approaches to development planning that have preceded the approach of community driven development, among others: communicative planning by Habermas, transactive planning by Friedmann, advocative planning by Davidoff, and collaborative planning by Healey. These approaches to planning have emerged to fulfill the needs of planning by different segments of society in the era of post-modernization/industrialization (postmodern planning). Various approaches or development strategies based on empowerment known today, including the people-centered approach or the participatory approach, can be said to be pragmatic postmodern planning approaches or is the practice of communicative, transactive, advocative and collaborative planning approaches. The latest participatory approach emphasizes the importance of the role of the community so that facilitators supporting these communities have to play their role in such way, for example not to dictate, so that everything related to development originates from the community itself (Adimihardja and Hikmat, 2003). This is a difficult role to play, especially with traditional communities, particularly when considering that their understanding of development is still limited, as the concept generally is modern in nature.

Cleary et al. (2003) show the various approaches described as people-centered approaches that were carried out in the Livelihood Support Program by FAO-UN in various regions with different cultural backgrounds. These approaches are Sustainable Livelihood Approaches (SLA), Gestion de Terroirs (GT), Integral Rural Development (IRD), Farming Systems (FS), and Latin America Approaches (LAA). Generally, these approaches mostly resemble the participatory approach in its early stages of development.

Other approaches as a strategy to involve the community, or known as participatory approaches, are (Hikmat, 2001): (1) Participatory Rural Appraisal (PRA), (2) Participatory Research and Development (PRD), (3) Participatory Rapid Appraisal, (4) Participatory Assessment and Planning (PAP), (5) Participatory Technology Development (PTD), (6) Participatory Learning Methods (PLM), (7) Participatory Action Research (PAR), & (8) Participatory Learning and Action (PLA).

The development of the participatory approach started with the RRA method (Rapid Rural Appraisal), which is a development approach in rural areas that aims to understand a problem through in-depth interviews or semi-structured questionnaires. The sample of the data collected receives less attention; there is more emphasis on the social and economic realities in a rural community. The PRA method, one of the expansions of the participatory approach, formulates the community's problem by identifying the problem, formulating the problem, finding the cause of the problem, formulating problem-solving strategies and developing action plans together through focus group discussion, rather than extracting individual opinions. In RRA, researchers are outsiders while in PRA, researchers are part of the community or are facilitators (Hikmat, 2001).

Another expansion of the participatory approach is PAR, which is considered to be similar to the teachings of Paulo Freire about changing the awareness of people to become critical. This is because society is assumed to first be needing assistance with the transfer of selected scientific knowledge and technical elements of knowing how to have the capacity to analyze and transform real needs (Cleary et al., 2003). Another approach, Participatory Learning and Action (PLA) is also an expansion of previous participatory approaches which does not have a consistent evaluation process on what has been carried out. PLA emphasizes the reflection process which is also done by the community itself. Therefore, this method requires more time than the RRA and PRA methods (Hikmat, 2001).

The following (Table 2) are some of the main characteristics of the participatory approach according to Pretty (1995).

Table 2. Participatory Methods as Alternative System of Learning and Acting

Group Methods & Team Dynamics	Sampling Methods	Interviews & Dialogues	Diagram & Visualization Methods
Team of contract workers	Transect Walks	Semi-structured interviews	Mapping and modeling
Assessment & discussion team	Ordering (ranking) of welfare	Direct observation	Social mapping and levels of welfare
Guidelines and interview checklist	Social mapping	Focus group	Transects
Fast reports writing	Interview mapping	Key informants	Mobility mapping
Give encouragements		Ethnic biography and history	Seasonal calendar
Cooperation (take part in local activities)		Oral history	Profile of activity and daily routine
Joint presentations		Case studies, portraits, and local stories	Profile of history
Personal daily diary and record of the process			Trend analysis and timeline
			Matrices scoring
			Order (ranking) preference
			Venn diagram
			Networking diagram
			System diagram
			Flow diagram
			Pie Charts

Source: Pretty (1995)

As empowerment places people as main actors, the success of empowerment is highly dependent on the response, involvement, and responsibility of the community towards community empowerment programs, or in other words at the level of community participation. Community empowerment requires the following conditions in order to create a participatory role throughout the whole local community (Dasgupta, 2007): (a) decentralization, (b) democracy, and (c) collective action. The level of success of any community-driven development program using a participatory approach will be high in communities that have a high level of participation, have equality among its members, and have high competence for dialogue (Sufianti, 2014). A study by Sufianti (2014) showed that a certain leadership role of the government can make a collaborative plan run effectively in communities in urban areas lacking these ideal conditions. Further studies are needed in order to apply this to communities in rural areas still needs further study.

Arnstein (1969) introduced a 'ladder of citizen participation' model, which looks at the level of community involvement from the highest level of participation such as control by citizens until

pseudo participation such as manipulation. There are eight stages of participation, which are divided into three groups, namely:

1. Non-participation, which consists of (a) manipulation (participation is driven by outsiders, the community only becomes the object of development), (b) therapy (solutions to community problems are given by outsiders).
2. Tokenism, comprising: (a) informing (one-way delivery of information to the community about programs), (b) consultation (delivery of information about development is two-way between community and government although still limited), (c) placation (involving community representatives in the development program, but the decision remains in the hands of the government).
3. Citizen Power, consisting of (a) partnership (public and government cooperate on equal footing), (b) delegated power (government giving some trust to the public to make decisions), (c) citizen control (the public has full control and takes decisions unconditionally).

and expanded typology of participant is presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Participation typology

Typology	Characteristics
Manipulative participation	The community is considered to be represented by the manager of the program. The community has no power.
Passive participation	The community is not involved since the beginning of the planning but only informed about the existence of the program. Information fully belongs to the professionals.
Participation through consultation	Participation is demonstrated through consultation or by answering questions by the program manager. The community is not involved from problem formulation until decision-making. The program management formulates until the decision making and is not obliged to carry out the community's aspirations.
Participation because of material incentives	Participation is shown by donating resources such as personnel because there are rewards such as food, money or other incentives. Farmers, for instance, provide land and workers but are not involved in the process of experimentation and learning. Participation will stop the moment the incentive is stopped.
Functional participation	Participation is a way to achieve the program objectives. Communities participate by forming groups to meet the goals of the project or initiate an outside social organization. Such involvement tends not to happen in the early stages of the project cycle or at the planning stage but after the major decisions have been made. Achieving the goals of the program depends on the facilitator and outsiders, even though the program later might become independent.
Interactive participation	Participation is a right, not just a means to achieve program objectives. The community is involved from the beginning of development planning, such as in the preparation of work plans and the establishment of new local organizations, or in the strengthening of existing institutions. Interdisciplinary methodology is used, derived from a variety of perspectives and learning processes are systematic and structured. This group takes control of the decisions so that the community can maintain its structures or practices.
Self-mobilization	Community participate through own initiative without relying on outside agencies to change the system. They develop contacts with external institutions for resources and advice they need but still retain control over the use of these resources. This type of participation can spread out if it is supported by government agencies and NGOs.

Source: Pretty (1995)

In practice, community empowerment involves various institutions such as: government (central or local), local community institutions (Community-based Organizations/CBOs), Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs), the private sector, and sponsor funding. The World Bank classifies relationships between these institutions into three alternative groups, as follows (Dongier et al., 2001):

1. Cooperation/partnership between local community organizations and local governments.
2. Cooperation/partnership between local community organizations and supporting private organizations (NGOs or private companies).
3. Cooperation/partnership between local community organizations and the central government or the sources of funding.

The first alternative (partnerships between CBOs and local governments) is preferred if the desired condition of decentralization has already been created. This approach can strengthen national systems in transferring resources between governments, and allow for the decisions on resource allocation to be local priorities. In situations where decentralization is not a government priority, then the second and third alternative approaches would be more appropriate.

Social Change of Society

Social change is a change in the community-based organizations in a society, which affects the social system, including the values, attitudes, and patterns of behavior among groups in society (Soekanto, 1996). Social change in society will be accompanied by a process of reorganization and disorganization. Reorganization or reintegration in society is the process of establishing new norms and values in order to conform to changing community-based organizations. Disorganization or disintegration is the weakening process of norms or values in society due to these changes. The noticeable manifestation of disorganization is the emergence of social problems (Soekanto, 1996).

Cultural lag theory states that the most obvious lag in human life is a lag in thinking due to extremely rapid technological developments, this generally occurs in traditional societies that are developing (Ogburn, in Lauer, 2003). This wide gap is anticipated through the establishment of programs to speed up development that eventually can give rise to negative reactions from the traditional communities resulting from a change of their traditions and habits that happens too fast. These negative reactions are demonstrated by the low level of community participation in every modern development program.

Social change in traditional communities can occur due to several internal and external factors. As an outside concept, community-driven development falls into the category of external factors. This concept can be considered as social invention in traditional communities so that together with their own efforts they are able to develop their environment. This is despite the fact that this movement is not new at all because in some of the activities in their environment, traditional communities already working together or applying mutual cooperation. What is still novel to these communities is this development itself, or a new civilization with more advanced technology. It is important to remember that there is a big lag between the cultures of traditional communities with the new civilization using advanced technology. Efforts in accelerating this imbalance reduction through development programs lead to disorganization (social problems) in traditional communities because they cannot keep up with these fast changes.

There are a couple approaches or strategies known for achieving social change in communities through development, namely: facilitative strategies, re-educative strategies, persuasive strategies, power strategies, and violence versus non-violence strategies (Harper, 1989, in Martono, 2014). Lauer (2003) further mentions strategies or approaches to change behavior and social attitudes in communities as follows: centralized power approaches (authoritarian), delegation of authority approaches (elite), and equality of power approaches (democratic). The participatory approach that is often used today can be categorized as a democratic approach but this approach may not be effective for all cultures. According to Lauer (2003), the authoritarian approach is more effective in communities in the early stages of their modernization. The adaptability of each community towards community-driven development will vary according to their culture or civilization, so a different approach to development is needed.

Traditional Communities

According to the Alliance of Traditional Communities Nusantara, or abbreviated as AMAN in Indonesian, at the First Congress in 1999, traditional communities are groups of people who have ancestral origin (hereditary) in a certain geographic area and have a system of values, ideology, economy, politics, culture, social system, and have their own territory (Siscawati, 2014). Indigenous culture is the manifestation of the concept of culture consisting of cultural values, norms, laws, and rules related to each other that form a system. Culture according to Hofstede (2005) is the pattern of thinking, feeling, and acting collectively that distinguishes members of a community group from other groups. Culture is learned from the social environment and collected life experiences. Culture manifests itself in several ways: symbols, heroism, rituals, and values. Symbols, heroism, and rituals are called cultural practices, while the values form the core of the culture.

Traditional communities in many countries have lived in harmony with the natural environment, have ecological values and are able to meet basic human needs through social, economic and political structures that form the intrinsic base of their community. Development of traditional communities should be seen as a way all people can learn from communities that are already able to maintain their organic link with the natural environment and their social base in human communities, not as a way of doing that has to be done for traditional communities (Ife and Tesoriero, 2008). Due to this, community-driven development for traditional communities or ethnodevelopment is fitting to develop these communities. Development according to this concept is about making indigenous inhabitants become more resilient to more dominant surrounding communities through programs that pay attention to their culture and produce autonomous levels of economy, social, and politics, enabling this group of people to work based on their own level of adaptation, forming their own synthesis of social, culture, and economy (Talalla, 1984, in Amien, 2005).

The progress of civilization of a traditional community can be seen also from the community's ability to interact with the outside world (modern civilization). In Indonesia alone, there are a number of categories of traditional communities that have different levels of civilization depending on their customary provisions in interacting with outsiders. Traditional communities in Indonesia are divided into four large groups with their own characteristics as follows (AMAN, in Ministry of National Development Planning / BAPPENAS, 2013, p.8-9):

1. Kanekes' traditional community type in Banten and 'Kajang' or 'To Kajang' (Kajang Dalam) in Bulukumba Regency, South Sulawesi, who place themselves as *'Pertapa Bumi'*

(Earth Ascetic). They believe that they are 'chosen' and that their community was given the task to preserve the earth's conservation through prayer and an ascetic lifestyle.

2. Kasepuhan Banten Kidul' and 'Suku Naga' traditional community types that can be found in West Java. These communities are essentially quite strict in preserving and implementing their traditions and customs but are still open to having commercial relations with the outside world. These community types are socially unique, particularly in their relationship to agrarian resources, in terms of a system of values that are adhered to, myths and origins. Sundanese ethnic groups, for example, can be categorized as an ethnic group geographically spread out over all of West Java. They use the Sundanese language and in general embrace Islam. However, the Suku Naga and Baduy, although a part of the Sundanese ethnic group, are clearly unique in terms of beliefs and relationships with the earth and natural resources in their surroundings when compared to the Sundanese in general. If Islam has become an indispensable part of the Sundanese culture in general, the beliefs of the Suku Naga more resemble indigenous beliefs (Buhun), as with the Marapu beliefs in Sumba, or Kaharingan in Kalimantan.

3. Traditional community types whose lives are dependent on nature (i.e. forests, rivers, sea, etc.). They developed a unique system of natural resource management but did not develop strict traditions for housing or choice of crops compared to the traditional communities of Kaneke, To Kajang, or Kasepuhan. Included in this third group of communities are, among others, the traditional communities of Dayak and Penan in Kalimantan, Pakava and Lindu in Central Sulawesi, and Dani and Dafonsoro in Papua, Krui in Lampung, as well as Haruku in Maluku.

4. Traditional community types that have already been 'cut off' from their 'indigenous' system of natural resource management as a result of colonization that evolved over hundreds of years. Included in this category are the traditional communities of Melayu Deli living in the tobacco plantation area in North Sumatra and Betawi in Jabodetabek. They refer to themselves as watchmen.

Community-driven Development in Papua

The indigenous inhabitants of Papua can be categorized in the third type of traditional communities that was mentioned previously. Traditional communities in Papua still depend on nature. They are not closed off but instead are open to outside influences. As was mentioned earlier, since 2007, Papua has the RESPEK program to empower indigenous inhabitants living in villages. RESPEK has funding with a worth of 100.000.000 Rupiah per village each year. With a participatory approach, the utilization of these funds for development activities is determined entirely by the villagers. In 2008, the implementation of the PNPM RESPEK program in every village was accompanied by facilitators. Besides that, there are stipulations that regulate the use of RESPEK funds in order for the program objectives to be achieved. Therefore, not every activity proposed by the villagers can be funded by the RESPEK program, even if the idea comes from the community itself. This is done to prevent the repeat an incident of RESPEK funds distributed by villagers and then finished without undertaking development activities. Five priority development activities are funded by the RESPEK program, namely: fulfilling food and nutrition requirements, health, education, local economy, and village infrastructure.

Program implementation consists of five phases (Sari et al., 2011, p. 19):

1. Socialization of program and the selection of Village Companion (PK) and Village Activity Implementation Team (TPKK), usually through socialization and deliberation at the district and village level (Village Socialization Deliberation, MKS).

2. Training for Village Companion and Village Activity Implementation Team, given by the District Companion (PD).
3. Planning with the Community (PBM) to find problems following a set of ideas (proposed infrastructure) that comes from the community.
4. Preparation of the enactment of the proposal called Village Implementation Preparation Deliberation (MKPP).
5. Disbursement of funds and accountability of activities, starting from the stage 1 disbursement, followed by Village Accountability Deliberation I (MKP I), then stage 2, followed by MKP II and ending with Village Handover Deliberation (MKST).

Based on secondary data, which is the result of studies by several researchers, the following text will explain in general the results of community-driven development implemented in Papua.

Development in Keerom Regency

The results of development in Keerom Regency are still not felt yet by the indigenous inhabitants who for the majority are farmers. Turua (2014) states that the economic capacity of the indigenous farmers in Keerom Regency is lower when compared with migrant farmers because they still abide by a traditional lifestyle (subsistence). Their economic capacity currently only enables the farmers to fulfill a small portion of their basic needs. Also, their formal and non-formal education, as well as attitude and skills (performance) in cultivation in this region, is still low compared to non-Papuan farmers. Indigenous farmers in Papua have not fully relied on cultivation activities and still undertake activities of hunting and gathering. The size of land used by indigenous Papuan farmers is still very limited (on average 0.42 ha for crops and 1.48 ha for plantations). Meanwhile, the area of land owned is on average over 12.86 ha. Indigenous Papuan farmers from Keerom Regency still intensively gather from the potential of the forest and hunt wild animals. The use of agricultural technology by indigenous Papuan farmers is still very simple and they do not have the capital for the next planting season when compared with non-Papuan farmers. Cultural factors (social capital) are so strong that they negatively affect income and savings (Turua, 2014). This is despite the fact that the villages of Keerom have already received help from various development programs, including the PNPM RESPEK program and the Village Financial Assistance (BK3) program since 2011 or better knows as 1 billion rupiah financial aid for the villages (Wally, 2013). The development approach that was carried out is a participatory approach with the following general outline of program implementation phases (Wally, 2013, p.123-141):

1. Preparation for Program Discussion Administration to establish the membership of the Village Deliberation Body (BAMUSKAM) for one year, which includes: Head of Village, Secretary of Village, Chairman of BAMUSKAM, Vice Chairman of BAMUSKAM, Secretary of BAMUSKAM, Members of BAMUSKAM, Head of RW (neighborhood unit), Head of RT (community unit), Traditional Figure, Religious Leaders, Women's Leaders and Youth Leaders.
2. Village Deliberation (MUSKAM) Discussion and Preparation of BK3 Program
3. Village Deliberation (MUSKAM) Determination and Validation of BK3 Activities
4. Village Deliberation (MUSKAM) Submission and Distribution of BK3Funds
5. Implementation Activities and Reporting Accountability

Implementation of RESPEK in Papua

Another study shows that the implementation of the RESPEK program in South Yapen District, Yapen Islands Regency, Papua Province, was a failure which is indicated by the low participation and self-reliance of the community in developing basic infrastructure. The physical aspect of the development programs was realized well, but in social terms, the community is still not empowered and self-reliant. Among others, this can be seen from the case where citizens asked for compensation for crops that were affected by developments (Semboari, 2012).

In addition, a consultant reported that the level of public participation in the villages that have received help from the PNPM RESPEK program in Papua from 2008 to 2011 was still low. The low level of participation of villagers in the PNPM RESPEK program was caused among others due to the elite in their village (Sari et al., 2011). The population of villages in Papua consists of several segments with the following characteristics (Sari et al, 2011, p. 33-34):

1. The elite group of the villages, the head of a clan or strong tribal group who at the same time is head of the village. Kinship networks are 'adopted' into the governance structure of the village. Village institutions generally consist of the village government (the village head has a strong customary influence) and village deliberation board (Bamuskam/Baperkam). The main structure of village government in Papua consists of the head of the village who is a chieftain of the strongest clan. The village deliberation board usually consists of the head of customary traditions of the strongest clan, as well as two or three members of other strong clans. Economically, this elite, including the chief, is characterized by access to and control over productive resources (land, pigs, 'noken' (traditional bags), and settlements of honai (traditional houses)). The group of religious leaders is usually part of the elite despite the fact that its influence on village politics is not always strong.

2. Village activist groups, who generally have a network of kinship with the village elite, or have specific skills that are required in a program (e.g. able to speak Indonesian, teacher, civil servant, midwife, nurse) or because of their position in the church organization or in public service.

3. The most common group is the group of ordinary people. Generally, they do not have control toward the sources of power such as the chief or his relatives, but they still have access to cultivate fields, both in the strongest clans or in common clans (low hierarchy). Included in these circles are citizens of other tribes in Papua who married members of clans in the village.

4. Poor/marginal groups in Papua are groups who are unable to cultivate land. Their inability to cultivate land is caused by two factors. The first is due to aging or physical reasons (sickness). Widows are also included in this group. Their difficulties will increase if they are regarded as outsiders (e.g., married with members of indigenous clans or not belonging to the strongest tribe) and have a great dependency. Second, they do not have access to land because they are not members of the clan that owns the land.

In many places, especially in the mountains or areas that have not experienced assimilation with outsiders yet, class differences between social groups are not too strict, especially among the poorest and common groups. Besides the four groups mentioned above, the Papuans outside the clan or outsiders are considered to have no right to participate in decision-making. Power is concentrated in the circles of village elite. Lower groups do not have a say in decisions taken and usually only follow the elite group. Related to elite power, there are two types of elite relationship context in Papua. The first context is a village that has one powerful elite. Usually, only one clan is strong and a monopoly of power happens (e.g., village heads at the same time are the strongest clan elders). Second is a village that has more than one powerful elite, or

consists of two or more strong clan. In this context, usually a balance of power occurs (Sari et al, 2011).

When looking at every stage of the process of community-driven development mentioned above, officials in the village who are also clan elders will play a very instrumental role. Dialogues are a common thing to happen in traditional communities in Papua but when it comes to dealing with outsiders, or in this case the government, then the clan elder will be sent. The level of participation in the RESPEK program is mostly participation that involves the community representatives at the start of the development program (planning) but decision-making remains in the hands of the clan elders or elite groups in the village. In implementing the development program, the level of participation of members of the community happens because of material incentives, namely contribution in the form of labor or other material since they are compensated in the form of wages or money (tokenism placation). Such participation level will stop when the incentive ends or the RESPEK programs are completed, so sustainable community-driven development will possibly not occur.

When looking at the human development index (the quality of human resources is still low) and socio-cultural characteristics (civilizations different from modern civilizations), then the traditional communities in Papua, including the clan elders, are not in an ideal condition in implementing development with a participatory approach or RESPEK. Therefore, a more innovative method in participatory approach should be considered for these communities. At the beginning of the implementation of RESPEK, there were still villages that distributed RESPEK funds directly and spent it without undertaking developments. This shows that these village communities did not yet understand the sustainable use of resources for development which caused government intervention through the enactment of rules for using RESPEK funding for the next phase. Further, the domination of decision making by elite groups in the villages shows that the development process is not yet fully democratic. More innovative methods have to be considered to speed up the social learning process for traditional communities in Papua and taking into consideration that negative impacts from social change are happening in Papua after development started. This will be explained in the following section.

Negative Impacts of Development in Papua

Another factor that is expected to cause low levels of participation of indigenous communities in Papua in every development program is the negative response to outsiders/migrants and the government, which is an embodiment of the process of disorganization that continues until today. Changes in traditions and habits in Papua, which are taking place very quickly receive a negative response from the indigenous inhabitants, such as feeling less than satisfied, a passive attitude, apathy, and regression, and the belief that better times will come, as well as an aggressive and destructive attitude that emerges (Koentjaraningrat et al, 1994). Initially, they aimed their feelings of dissatisfaction at the Netherlands which they regarded as the cause of the quick changes that confused them (Kouwenhon, 1956, in Koentjaraningrat et al., 1994). Then they redirected their feelings at the Indonesian government and Indonesians coming from other provinces after Papua became part of Indonesia.

The emergence of negative reactions from the indigenous inhabitants of Papua can be understood as a response to the behavior and attitudes of migrant groups themselves, who took advantage of the great gap in knowledge between the indigenous inhabitants of Papua and them. The migrants, in the period 1963-1969, took advantage of the difference in the value of the Irian Barat Rupiah (Papua) and the Indonesian Rupiah to buy goods available in Papua to be sold to

other areas with great profits. Additionally, migrant groups viewed the indigenous inhabitants as primitive, ignorant, drunkards, idlers, etc. In contrast, the attitude of the migrants who considered themselves smarter, more civilized, etc. often became a laughingstock among the natives, who called them 'amberi' or unfriendly. The changes happening so rapidly which results in the elimination of traditions and patterns of everyday habits, where considered by natives to be the result of developments and this led to aggressive reactions, among others in the form of insurrections (Koentjaraningrat et al, 1994, p. 434-435). This is something that is still taking place in Papua until today.

Together with Aceh, Papua became the most volatile region after the reformation in 1998. The deep disappointment towards the 35-year journey (1963-1998) of becoming part of the Republic of Indonesia caused this volatility (Djojosoekarto et al, 2008). This turmoil of disintegration, resulting from disappointment towards development in Papua which is considered unsuccessful. Law 21 of 2001 which provides special autonomy can dampen this volatility of disintegration, although not completely because during the implementation of special autonomy until today there are still movements/demonstrations by indigenous inhabitants of Papua. They, among others: reject the special autonomy or want to return the special autonomy to the central government due to the disappointment about the results of development which still did not raise welfare of the indigenous inhabitants of Papua (who are still far behind if compared with migrant groups in Papua) and even demand the independence of Papua, separate from the Unitary State of the Republic of Indonesia.

Conclusion

Social change which was expected from community-driven development of traditional communities in Papua is still not realized. The development concept using a participatory approach, as already run by the RESPEK program, is still ineffective in triggering social change, as indicated by low levels of participation of traditional communities in development and the fact that there has not been an increase in their welfare. It should be noted that the socio-cultural differences, related to the progress of civilization, help determine the type of development approach that is most effective for a group of traditional communities.

Besides the need to pay attention to the process of reorganization in development activities which aspire for social change, the process of disorganization as a result of the implementation of these activities should also be noted, namely the emergence of social problems. In traditional communities in Papua, feelings of disappointment and dissatisfaction with the government and the migrants are still in their mind as there is still a welfare gap between indigenous inhabitants and migrants, even though this is also caused by their own inability to keep up with development that is happening quickly.

References

Adimihardja, K., and H. Hikmat (2003) *Participatory Research Appraisal dalam Pelaksanaan Pengabdian kepada Masyarakat.* Bandung: Humaniora Utama Press.

Amien, A.M. (2005) *Kemandirian Lokal, Konsepsi Pembangunan, Organisasi, dan Pendidikan dari Perspektif Sains Baru.* Jakarta: PT Gramedia Pustaka Utama.

Arnstein, S.R. (July 1969) A Ladder of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Planning Association* 35(4), 216-224.

Chambers, R. (2001) *PRA Participatory Rural Appraisal, Memahami Desa Secara Partisipatif.* Yogyakarta: Penerbit Kanisius.

Cleary, D., P. Baunmann, M. Bruno, X. Flores, and P. Warren (2003) People-Centred Approaches, A Brief Literature Review and Comparison Types. *LSP Working Paper*. FAO-UN.

Dasgupta, A., and V.A. Beard (2007) Community Driven Development, Collective Action and Elite Capture in Indonesia. *Development and Chance* 38(2), 229-249.

Diamond, J. (2015) *The World Until Yesterday (Dunia Hingga Kemarin), Apa yang Dapat Kita Pelajari dari Masyarakat Tradisional?*, Jakarta : KPG.

Djojosoekarto, A, R. Sumarwono, and C. Suryaman (2008) *Kinerja Otonomi Khusus Papua*. Jakarta: Kemitraan Bagi Pembaruan Tata Pemerintahan di Indonesia.

Dongier, P., J. Van Domelen, E. Ostrom, A. Rizvi, W. Wakeman, A. Bebbington, S. Alkire, T. Esmail, and M. Polski (2001) Community Driven Development. *World Bank*. Vol.1 - Core Techniques and Cross-Cutting Issues, 303-327.

Freire, P. (2007) *Politik Pendidikan: Kebudayaan, Kekuasaan, dan Pembebasan*. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Friedmann, J. (1981) Perencanaan Sebagai Proses Belajar, in D.C. Korten & Sjahrir (1988), *Pembangunan Berdimensi Kerakyatan*, pp. 250-257. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.

Hart, M.A. (2010) Indigenous Worldviews, Knowledge, and Research: The Development of an Indigenous Reserch Paradigm. *Journal of Indigenous Voices in Social Work* 1(1), 1-16.

Hikmat, H. (2001) *Strategi Pemberdayaan Masyarakat*. Bandung: Humaniora Utama Press.

Hofstede, G., and G.J. Hofstede (2005) *Cultures and Organizations: Software of The Mind*, 2nd Edition. USA: McGraw-Hill.

Ife, J., and F. Tesoriero (2008) *Community Development: Alternatif Pengembangan Masyarakat di Era Globalisasi*, Edisi ke-3. Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar.

Koentjaraningrat, R.P. Soejono, H.W. Bachtiar, Moh. Amir Sutaarga, D.C. Ajamiseba, F. Apomfires, K. Sapulete, N. Sanggenafa, J.R. Mansoben, J. Lamera, L. Siregar, O. Howay, P. Yaam, A.E. Dumatubun, K. Wanane, M.D.E. Roembiak, and Y. Biakai (1994) *Irian Jaya Membangun Masyarakat Majemuk*. Jakarta: Djambatan.

Korten, D.C. and Sjahrir (1988) *Pembangunan Berdimensi Kerakyatan*. Jakarta: Yayasan Obor Indonesia.

Lauer, R.H. (2003) *Perspektif Tentang Perubahan Sosial*. Jakarta: Rineka Cipta.

Martono, N. (2014) *Sosiologi Perubahan Sosial, Perspektif Klasik, Modern, Posmodern, dan Poskolonial*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Persada.

Ministry of National Development Planning/BAPPENAS (2013) *Masyarakat Adat di Indonesia: Menuju Perlindungan Sosial yang Inklusif*. Jakarta: Direktorat Perlindungan dan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat, Kementerian PPN/BAPPENAS.

Ministry of National Development Planning/BAPPENAS (2015) *Rencana Strategis Bidang Pemerintahan Desa*. Rakornas Program Pembinaan Penyelenggaraan Pemerintahan Desa Pusat dan Daerah Tahun 2015, Jakarta, Rabu/29 Juli 2015.

Pretty, J.N. (1995) *Participatory Learning For Sustainable Agriculture*, World Development, 23(8), 1247-1263.

Sari, Y.I., H. Rahman, and D.R.S. Manaf (2011) *Laporan Final Evaluasi PNPM RESPEK: Infrastruktur Pedesaan dan Kapasitas Kelembagaan*. Bandung: Akatiga-Center for Social Analysis.

Semboari, Y. (2012) *Pemberdayaan Kampung Bidang Perumahan dan Infrastruktur Dasar (Konteks Program Respek Papua), Studi di Distrik Yapen Selatan Kabupaten Kepulauan Yapen di Papua*, Tesis Program Studi Sosiologi, Universitas Gadjah Mada.

Siscawati, M. (2014) *Masyarakat Adat dan Perebutan Penguasaan Hutan*, Wacana 33(XVI), 3-23.

Soekanto, S. (1996) *Sosiologi Suatu Pengantar*. Jakarta: Raja Grafindo Perkasa.

Soleh, C. (2014) *Dialektika Pembangunan dengan Pemberdayaan*. Bandung: Fokusmedia.

Sufianti, E. (2014) Kepemimpinan dan Perencanaan Kolaboratif pada Masyarakat Non-Kolaboratif. *Jurnal Perencanaan Wilayah dan Kota* 25(1), 77-95.

Throsby, D. (2001) *Economic and Culture*. United Kingdom: Cambridge University Press.

Turua, U. (2014) *Model Pengembangan Kapasitas Ekonomi Petani Asli Papua Dalam Pembangunan Wilayah di Kabupaten Keerom*, Disertasi, Institut Pertanian Bogor.

Vallance, R.J. (2008) Melanesian Research Ethics. *DWU Research Journal* 8, 1-14.

Wally, Y. (2013) *Percepatan Pembangunan dan Kemandirian Kampung, Memahami "Gagasan Gila' Bantuan 1 Milyar Tiap Tahun Untuk Kampung Gaya YW (Yusuf Wally)*. Yogyakarta: BPFE-UGM.

artikel JRCP

10 Submitted to Academic Library Consortium
Student Paper
<1%

11 Submitted to University of East London
Student Paper
<1%

12 Submitted to President University
Student Paper
<1%

13 Submitted to Universiti Putra Malaysia
Student Paper
<1%

14 psflibrary.org
Internet Source
<1%

15 Submitted to Institut Pertanian Bogor
Student Paper
<1%

16 researchspace.ukzn.ac.za
Internet Source
<1%

17 www.iied.org
Internet Source
<1%

18 dspace.nwu.ac.za
Internet Source
<1%

19 repository.uin-malang.ac.id
Internet Source
<1%

20 www.genderwsis.org
Internet Source
<1%

21 banten.nomor.net
Internet Source
<1%