



MASYARAKAT KEBUDAYAAN DAN POLITIK

PILKADA dan Permasalahannya

Refleksi Diskriminasi Jender dalam Pilkada Langsung
Sri Endah Nurhidayati

**Perjuangan dan Peran Perempuan
di DPRD Jawa Timur 2004 - 2009**
Wahidah Zein Br Siregar

Gerakan Perempuan dan Partisipasi Politik
Pinky Saptandari

**Memperbincangkan Kembali
Teori Negara Pembangun**
Kacung Marijan

**The Bottom-up Approach within Urban Poverty Alleviation
Strategies and Its Constraints**
*A Theoretical Perspective with A Special Reference
to the Indonesian Context*
Sulikah Asmorowati

**Lansia dalam Upacara Adat Batak
Mempertahankan Citra dan Jatidiri**
Meutia Farida Swasono

**Pengelolaan Perusahaan yang Baik
(Good Corporate Governance)**
Toto Warsoko Pikir

MASYARAKAT KEBUDAYAAN DAN POLITIK

Diterbitkan oleh Fakultas Ilmu Sosial dan Ilmu Politik Universitas Airlangga, sebagai terbitan berkala tiga bulan sekali yang menyajikan tulisan-tulisan untuk lebih mempopulerkan ilmu kemasyarakatan ke tengah khalayak peminat dan untuk membuka forum belajar-mengajar yang lebih efektif

Pemimpin Umum

Hotman M. Siahaan

Wakil Pemimpin Umum

I. Basis Susilo

Penanggungjawab

Kris Nugroho

Dewan Redaksi

Soetandyo Wignjosoebroto (Unair)

Ramlan Surbakti (Unair)

Daniel Theodore Sparringa (Unair)

Mohtar Mas'ood (UGM)

Ashadi Siregar (UGM)

Herudjati Purwoko (Undip)

Edy Suhardono (Ubaya)

Pemimpin Redaksi

Doddy S. Singgih

Sekretaris Redaksi

Harijono

Redaksi Pelaksana

Bagong Suyanto

Yuyun Wahyu Izzati

Helmy Prasetyo

Produksi dan Pemasaran

Herwanto

STT No. 841/SK/Ditjen PPG/STT/1981

ISSN 0216-2407

Alamat Redaksi : FISIP Unair Jl. Airlangga 4-6 Surabaya 60286, Indonesia

Telepon: 031-5034015, Fax: 031-5022492

e-mail: mkp@sby.centrin.net.id

PENGANTAR REDAKSI

Pada bulan-bulan ini beberapa KPUD menyelenggarakan hajatan lanjutan —setelah KPU pusat melaksanakan pemilihan langsung paket Presiden dan Wakil Presiden— yaitu mengadakan Pemilihan Kepada Daerah (Pilkada) secara langsung. Atmosfer yang kondusif bagi penyelenggaraan pemilihan yang demokratis dan langsung menyentuh masyarakat diharapkan mampu meningkatkan derajat partisipasi masyarakat dalam bidang politik. Sebagaimana diketahui, bahwa pada masa lalu pemilihan pimpinan daerah seringkali tidak mampu menjawab permasalahan daerah, hal ini disebabkan sosok pimpinan atau kepala daerah bukan berasal dari daerah tersebut atau bahkan masyarakat pemilih tidak tahu menahu terhadap calon pemimpinnya. Ibarat kata “bagai memilih kucing di dalam karung” idiom ini tepat untuk menggambarkan kondisi riil di daerah sebelum digulirkannya Pilkada ini.

Harapan positif dan keadaan yang makin demokratis disandarkan pada Pilkada yang ternyata pada akhirnya tidak lebih baik dari masa lalu ketika pemilihan kepala daerah berdasar pilihan partai politik yang notabene adalah amanat masyarakat. Warna-warni Pilkada turut menyadarkan kita bahwa pada hakikatnya masyarakat masih belum interest terhadap proses tersebut, apalagi pilihan masyarakat pada calonnya tidak dapat memecahkan permasalahan daerah bahkan meninggalkan masyarakat pemilihnya untuk tujuan, motif pribadi dan politik. Antusiasme pemilih dapat dilihat dengan makin maraknya prosentase golput yang kian meningkat dari berbagai daerah pemilihan, hal ini merupakan sinyal kuat bahwa Pilkada masih belum mampu memobilisasi pemilih untuk aktif, apalagi tuntutan praktis kehidupan sehari-hari masyarakat makin menghimpit serta janji-janji pada masa kampanye bakal calon pemimpin daerah kerap disalahgunakan ketika pimpinan tersebut sudah berhasil memangku jabatan yang diimpikannya.

Tulisan-tulisan yang masuk di meja redaksi pada dasarnya adalah refleksi serta evaluasi dari hasil Pilkada yang telah berlangsung, antara lain: dari sisi partisipasi gender tulisan Sri Endah Nurhidayati tentang Refleksi Diskriminasi Gender dalam Pilkada Langsung, kemudian Perjuangan dan Peran Perempuan di DPRD Jawa Timur oleh Wahidah Zein Br Siregar, disambung dengan Gerakan Perempuan dan Partisipasi Politik oleh Pinky Saptandari, dari sisi politik Kacung Marijan mengulas Teori Negara Pembangun, dari sisi administrasi The Bottom-Up Approach within Urban Poverty Alleviation Strategies and Its Constraints dikupas Sulikah Asmorowati, pada topik lain Lansia dalam Upacara Adat Batak ditulis oleh Meutia Farida Swasono, dan Pengelolaan Perusahaan yang Baik oleh Toto Warsoko Pikir

Semoga kehadiran jurnal ilmiah *Masyarakat, Kebudayaan dan Politik* ini dapat memberikan alternatif pemecahan masalah sekaligus menjadi media interaksi yang dapat menjembatani para ahli, ilmuwan sosial, pemerhati masalah sosial-politik dan berbagai pihak terkait dalam mengkomunikasikan gagasan serta ide untuk pembangunan serta perkembangan masyarakat yang senantiasa berubah.

Redaksi

Topik Utama Edisi No. 4 (Oktober) 2005:
Dampak Kenaikan BBM

DAFTAR ISI

Pengantar Redaksi

iii

Daftar Isi

v

Refleksi Diskriminasi Jender dalam Pilkada Langsung

Sri Endah Nurhidayati

1

Perjuangan dan Peran Perempuan di DPRD Jawa Timur

2004 - 2009

Wahidah Zein Br Siregar

13

Gerakan Perempuan dan Partisipasi Politik

Pinky Saptandari

27

Memperbincangkan Kembali Teori Negara Pembangun

Kacung Marijan

41

**The Bottom-up Approach Within Urban Poverty Alleviation
Strategies And Its Constraints**

*A Theoretical Perspective with A Special Reference
to the Indonesian Context*

Sulikah Asmorowati

53

**Lansia dalam Upacara Adat Batak
Mempertahankan Citra dan Jatidiri**

Meutia Farida Swasono

75

**Pengelolaan Perusahaan yang Baik
(Good Corporate Governance)**

Toto Warsoko Pikir

93

THE BOTTOM-UP APPROACH WITHIN URBAN POVERTY ALLEVIATION STRATEGIES AND ITS CONSTRAINTS A Theoretical Perspective with A Special Reference to the Indonesian Context

Sulikah Asmorowati

Dosen Jurusan Ilmu Administrasi Negara FISIP Unair, Surabaya

Abstract

Artikel ini mengkaji secara teoritis pendekatan pembangunan berbasis bottom-up approach dalam strategi pengentasan kemiskinan, khususnya untuk kemiskinan perkotaan. Pendekatan yang secara harfiah diartikan sebagai pendekatan dari bawah ke atas ini telah cukup lama menjadi pendekatan pembangunan favorit yang melengkapi atau bahkan menggantikan inisiatif-inisiatif atau strategi-strategi pembangunan bertipe top down (pembangunan dari atas ke bawah) sebelumnya. Diskusi selanjutnya diarahkan pada faktor-faktor yang menjadi penghambat pendekatan pembangunan yang secara intrinsik ideal dan secara konseptual sangat baik ini.

Keywords: kemiskinan perkotaan, pengentasan kemiskinan, bottom-up approaches, top-down approach, faktor penghambat.

Most international agencies have now made poverty reduction their primary objective (Moser 1998) showing that tackling poverty is very much on the global development agenda¹. Meanwhile, although the importance of urban poverty is increasingly recognised, the facts of underestimation of its scale

and nature remain (Anonym 1995; Satterthwaite 1997, Satterthwaite 2003; Amis 2001). As Amis (2001) rightly argues, the WDR 2000/2001 has ignored the position and the condition of the urban poor. This is reflected in the fact that almost all of the case studies are drawn from rural material, while urban poverty case

¹ Evidence can be drawn for instance from the 2000/2001 World Development Report (WDR 2000/2001) on attacking poverty (World Bank 2000), the 2004 World Development Report on 'Making Services Work for Poor' (World Bank <http://econ.worldbank.org/wdr/wdr2004/text-30023/>), as well as the unprecedented declaration of solidarity and determination to eradicate poverty (the UN Millenium Declaration in September 2000) which then is implemented with a set

studies only appear in two out of 94 examples in the report². Similarly, Satterthwaite (2003) identifies the lack of an urban poverty focus within the Millennium Development goals (MDGs), which omits mention of the safety nets, stronger asset bases and the protection of civil and political rights by the rule of law, which are important more particularly for most urban poor groups³. So, despite the increasing concerns about urban poverty, these examples seem to continue to validate the position of urban poverty which Amis (2001:358) calls a 'minority' status. In spite of commitment to poverty reduction, including urban poverty, experience shows that poverty reduction strategies (still) face many problems. According to Satterthwaite (2003), this will reflect the approaches taken in the poverty reduction strategies.

This paper deals with the approaches to poverty alleviation within the urban context with emphasis on the bottom up approach and the constraints in its implementation within development projects at the community level. As a background, brief overview of definitions

of poverty, as well as an explanation of urban poverty, its nature and complexity and also its relations with rural poverty are discussed, followed subsequently by discussion of the Indonesian context.

Overview of definition of poverty and Indonesia's definition of poverty

Definition of poverty

Generally the concept of poverty correlates to a lack or deficiency of the necessities required for human survival and welfare. Despite the fact that the setting of an acceptable standard of living in defining poverty is an important policy matter, there is not yet any consensus on what constitutes basic human needs or acceptable standard of living and how they are identified (Mills and Pernia 1994; Wratten 1995). Since 1990, the number of poor has grown, and along with it, the conceptual debate regarding how to define and measure poverty. This has led to the emergence of the "new poverty agenda". This new poverty agenda has summarized two polarized alternative approaches to poverty namely: the conventional objective

of goals under the millennium development goals (MDGs) (UNDP 2003; http://www.developmentgoals.org/-About_the_goals.htm). One of the remarkable goals is the noble declaration as halving extreme income poverty (that is the proportion of people whose income/consumption is less than one dollar a day) in the developing world between 1990 and 2015 (detail see <http://www.paris21.org/-betterworld/poverty.htm>). Indeed, the first seven of the MDGs are directed at reducing all forms of poverty (http://www.developmentgoals.org/-About_the_goals.htm). Furthermore, the Bretton Woods institutions have strongly argued for an enhanced poverty reduction framework in low-income countries and the associated notion of 'poverty reduction strategy papers' (PRSPs). (Islam 2002).

² More critical arguments in this issue see Amis (2001)

³ Although there are also explicit goals concerning urban issues, especially the goal of significantly improving the lives of at least 100 million slum dwellers or a commitment to increase the proportion of the population with secure tenure, which particularly relevant with urban dwellers who typically struggle for competing spaces <http://www.paris21.org/betterworld/poverty.htm>: Islam2002; Hjorth 2003; Satterthwaite 2003).

approach and the participatory approach (Wratten 1995; Moser 1998).

The conventional economic definition of poverty identifies income/consumption as the best proxy for poverty (Ravallion 1992 in Moser 1998). Although it is not the only measure of human welfare, practically it is the most commonly used. According to this definition, poor people are those whose income (or consumption) is less than that required to meet certain defined needs. Thus, its emphasis is on the material well-being. The minimum level of income necessary to meet the defined set of needs is the so-called poverty line (Lok Dessalieu 1999; Wratten 1995).

Unfortunately, the poverty lines for urban poverty are often set too low to cover the cost of non-food essentials such as transport, school fees, housing, clean water and environmental considerations such as garbage collection. Moreover, they are also generally set without making sufficient allowance for the cost of what might be termed minimum adequate quality housing. Thus a large number of the population living in very poor quality housing in cities in developing countries are not considered poor. This in turn further leads to an underestimation of urban poverty (Anonym 1995; Satterthwaite 1997).

As this conventional definition of poverty implies an external decision about who the poor are,⁴ a more appropriate definition of poverty can be made base on participation. With the assumption that

people's own conceptions of disadvantage differ markedly from those of the professional 'expert', participatory definitions of poverty focus on the immediate needs of the poor from their own perspectives (Wratten 1995). This participatory definition uses multiple, subjective indicators of poverty status based on the experience of the poor, collected from participatory techniques, such as focus groups. It thus concerns more of the qualitative dimensions of poverty, such as equity, independence, security, self-respect, close and non exploitative social relationships, and decision making freedom (Moser 1998; Francis in Wratten 1995). Briefly, it recognises the diversity of perceptions of poverty and thus facilitates an understanding of its many dimensions for a particular group.

Finally, poverty is seen as the deprivation of basic capabilities, rather than merely economic need. This pertains to non-income dimensions of poverty and focuses on unmet basic needs, particularly in terms of health, housing and education (Sen 1999). Whichever approaches are taken to define poverty, as Alcock (1997) and Hemmer (1994) have pointed out, it should be noted that definitions of poverty are a locally specific phenomenon. Poor people are a heterogenous group in which there are many groups with divergent needs (such as women and children, rural and urban poor) that need to be considered. In this way, factors that are possibly used to explain the phenomenon of poverty of a certain poor community may be completely different from that of other

⁴ Indeed, the poverty line, it has been argued, is "inherently a subjective judgment about what is an acceptable minimum standard of living in a particular society" in which "the 'poor' are labeled as poor by outsiders, not according to their own criteria" (Wratten 1995: 16).

communities. Thus, the definition of poverty, which applies in a certain community, could carry different meaning when it is applied in different social entities (in Dharmawan 2000).

Indonesia's definition of poverty

Indonesia has its own definition of poverty that is claimed to be appropriate to its own context. However, there is still much controversy over definitions of poverty in Indonesia, as well as over the use of conventional economic definitions (income-consumption approach) versus non-conventional definitions (Kumorotomo 2001). According to the conventional definition, poverty is defined based on more universal and comparable indicators such as calorie consumption, minimum income, or basic needs. For example, since 1976, the Indonesian Central Bureau of Statistics (BPS), has created its own measures of poverty based on a periodic Household Survey (SUSENAS). It uses a standard of 2,100 calorie for individual intake per day as a benchmark, considered as the minimum food requirement plus a rupiah value of a bundle of non food items considered as basic non food requirements (Kumorotomo 2001; Suryahadi and Sumarto 2003).

According this definition, in 1999, the BPS set the poverty line for urban areas in Indonesia as Rp. 96,182 and for its rural counterpart Rp. 72,312. Based on these poverty lines, until May 1999, the urban and rural poverty rate accounted for 21,58% and 25,27% respectively (Suryahadi and Sumarto 2003). Meanwhile, the National Family Planning Coordinating Board (BKKBN) uses different indicators to describe poverty in Indo-

nesia. It classifies all households in Indonesia into five welfare status groups: (i) Pre-Prosperous Households (*Keluarga Pra Sejahtera* or KPS, hereafter KPS), (ii) Prosperous Households Level I (*Keluarga Sejahtera I* hereafter KS I), (iii) KS II, (iv) KS III, and (v) KS III+ (BKKBN 1994 in Suryahadi and Sumarto 2003; BKKBN in Daly and Fane). In these categories, KPS are considered as poor households, but sometimes they include KS I households (in this case then KPS is considered to be the poorest).

A household is classified as a KPS household if it fails to fulfil any one of the following five conditions: (i) all household members practice their religious obligations; (ii) all household members eat at least twice a day; (iii) all household members have different sets of clothing for work, school and visiting; (iv) the largest part of the house floor is not made of earth; and (v) sick household members and contraceptive users have access to modern medical services. At the next level, a family which is not able to fulfil any one of the six additional characteristics, including eating meat, fish and eggs (protein) at least once a week (these are considered to be expensive in Indonesia), purchasing one set of clothes in the previous year, all family members between 10 to 65 being literate, families with children who have not dropped out of school for economic reasons and families not headed by unemployed adults are categorised as KS I. KS II families therefore are those which able to fulfil these eleven conditions. To be in KS III, KS II families have to fulfil further nine conditions while to be a KS III plus there are two more conditions. To reach the highest welfare status of KS III+, therefore, a household has to pass a

total of 22 indicators (Kumorotomo 2001; Suryahadi and Sumarto 2003a; Sumarto, Suryahadi and Widyanti, in Daly and Fane, 2002). With these indicators the number of KPS and KS I in 2001 were respectively 11,578,282 and 14,248,709.

To identify which group a household belongs to, BKKBN's cadres all over the country collect the data through direct household visits and interviews. However, in many cases they tended to collect the information from neighborhood or households chiefs (RTs and RWs). This has led to doubt about the accuracy and reliability of the data (Suryahadi and Sumarto 2003a). When the 1997 economic crisis hit Indonesia, and led to a worsening and chaotic situation during much of 1998, the government responded by establishing several social safety net programs. The majority of these programs, including sale of subsidized rice, scholarships for school children, free medical services, use the BKKBN data to target their beneficiaries. The static nature of the BKKBN indicators may not be able to capture shocks suffered by households (especially after the crisis), but there has simply been no other household database available in the country (Suryahadi and Sumarto 2003a).

Significantly, amongst issues in the problems of poverty identification in Indonesia is a tendency to underestimate the magnitude and intensity of the poor in official statistics, especially after the crisis. This is especially so because in Indonesia, poverty is seen as a deprivation of basic needs that cannot capture many other aspects of deprivation (Breman in

Dhanani and Islam 2002). Accordingly, there is great urgency to incorporate the non-income dimensions of poverty in Indonesia that are somewhat addressed by the BKKBN indicators of poverty. Nevertheless, by using the BKKBN's indicator, the government continues to employ a 'crudely' evolutionary terminology that describes the poorest as "pre-prosperous" (indeed this is the definition of poverty that is most widely used in the poverty alleviation programs in Indonesia). This may reflect the government's refusal to admit that poverty is any more than a transient phenomenon connected to the 'growing pains' involved in economic development.

Overview of urban poverty

This section discusses the overview of urban poverty in its relations with rural poverty as well as its nature, followed by *discussion of urban poverty in Indonesia*.

Urban poverty and its relations with rural poverty: Is it useful to distinguish?

While the poor have much in common with each other wherever they live and there are interactions between rural and urban societies and economies, there are important reasons to examine rural and urban poverty separately.⁵ The major reason is that there are some substantial differences in the characteristics of urban and rural poverty, which affect the identification and the understanding of the poverty problems and thus the different analysis, formulation and implementations of

⁵ In terms of definition it seems that urban poverty is not different with rural poverty. However, the differentials appear in the poverty measurement (Mills and Pernia 1994)

appropriate interventions (Mills and Pernia 1994; World Bank nd-a). Similar to the concept of poverty, there has not been any consensus on what constitutes 'urban'. The term "urban" is typically characterized by density of settlement in a contiguously built-up area, by the structure of economic activity, and sometimes by administrative attributes. However, there are no common criteria for deciding whether a settlement is a town or a rural village. Additionally, there are also variations in the minimum population thresholds amongst countries (World Bank nd-a).⁶

Accordingly, instead of viewing rural and urban in a dualistic classification, it has proposed that the urban-rural divide should be treated as a continuum (Fay nd; World Bank nd-a; Wratten 1995). It is argued that there are functional linkages between cities, smaller towns and rural areas, such as rural-urban migration, seasonal labour, markets for food, industrial goods and services, water supply and demand, education and health care facilities, remittance incomes and family support networks, which show that problems in one area cannot be treated in isolation from the others (Wratten 1995). Besides, over time, transitions from a predominantly rural to more heavily urban population take place in almost all countries as their economic development progresses. Indeed, this transition as well as the nature of the inter-linkages impacts upon the relative levels of income in the two areas and on the types of problems faced by the poorer

and disadvantaged members of each population in each area (World Bank nd-a). This will be explored in the next section.

Urban poverty: its nature and multi-dimensional aspects

According to the World Bank urban poverty is a multidimensional phenomenon, and the poor suffer from various deprivations. It identifies five dimensions of urban poverty; income poverty, health, education poverty, personal and security and empowerment (Baharoglu and Kessides 2001; World Bank nd). Numerous characteristics of urban poverty have been identified in the quite extensive urban poverty literature (Amis 1995; Baharoglu and Kessides 2001; Saterthwaite 1997, 2001; Mitlin 2003, 2003a; Moser 1998; Wratten 1995). This paper identifies the main aspects of urban poverty as follows:

- Lack of income, and thus inadequate consumption of basic necessities, such as food, and safe and clean water.
- Lack of assets for individuals, household or communities.
- Inadequate shelter, characterised by poor quality, overcrowding, poor sanitation and illegal and insecure housing, due to competition of scarce land.
- Insufficient provision of public infrastructure, such as piped water, sanitation, drainage, roads etc.
- Inadequate provision for basic services, including education, health care, transportation and law enforcement.

⁶ For example, in Canada, settlement with 1000 people qualify as town, while in Kenya, Jordan and Japan the limit is 2000, 10,000 and 50,000 respectively (UNHCS 1987 in Wratten 1995). Meanwhile in Latin America, specifically Mexico, an area constitutes as urban if the settlements are between 2500 to 19 million (Fay nd, <http://www.worldbank.org/urban/poverty/docs/iw/fay.pdf>)

- Limited or no security to ensure adequate consumption when there is a reduction in income.
- Insufficient protection of citizen's rights such as equal treatment under the law, protection from discrimination and exploitation, protection from violence and other crime, and protection on occupational health, safety and pollution control.
- Voicelessness and powerlessness within political and bureaucratic structures as well as little chance to participate in the design and implementation of urban poverty programs (Satterthwaite 2001:146; Mitlin 2003:395).

The crucial element in these characteristics is the existence of vulnerability, which is closely related to asset ownership amongst the urban poor. People become less vulnerable and insecure if they hold more assets. These assets comprise: labor (financial capital), human capital (health, education skills and ability to work), productive assets (most important is housing), infrastructure (physical capital) and lastly household and community relations (social capital) (Moser 1998; Baharoglu and Kessides 2001; Mitlin 2003).

To sum up, although drawing a clear distinction between urban and rural poverty is difficult, the effects of urban poverty are uniquely compounded by the nature of the urban environment, which is often characterised by commercial exchanges, social fragmentation and inappropriate state interventions that lead to vulnerability and lack of asset ownership. Accordingly, policy responses and program options to reduce urban poverty need to be structured around the theme of

strengthening the assets of the poor to reduce their vulnerability (Baharoglu and Kessides 2001; Moser 1998; Mitlin 2003; Wratten 1995)

Urban Poverty in Indonesia

According to the Urban Poverty Project (UPP)'s project appraisal document, a recent review of the urban sector in Indonesia (carried out by the Asian Development Bank (2001)) indicates that at least 15.7 million urban dwellers were poor in 1999 out of a total urban population of 81.4 million (using the new SUSENAS 1998 definition of the poverty line). However, it is estimated that a much larger percentage of people, -nearly half of the entire population-is vulnerable to poverty and struggles to avoid falling back into poverty (in World Bank PAD 1999). It is clear that poverty will become an increasingly urban issue due to the pace of urbanization. This is shown by the fact that in 1980, there were only about 32.9 millions people (22%) living in urban areas in Indonesia while in 2001 it increased to a level of 87.7 million or 42% of the total population (in Tambunan 2003: np). Meanwhile, each year there is an addition of 3 million to the urban population in Indonesia. With a total current population exceeding 200 million, it is also expected that, the urban population will exceed the rural population by the end of the decade (Suselo and van der Hoff 2002: 46).

A total of almost 41% of the urban population is concentrated in the four largest cities in Indonesia; Jakarta, Surabaya, Bandung and Medan (Firman 1999: 72). The growth in urban poverty was further worsened by the macro economic shocks in the 1997 crisis that continue to have a

worse impact on urban areas than on rural areas where traditional support networks tend to cushion economic blows more effectively. Studies show that in 1998, GDP in urban areas declined by 18% as compared to a national GDP decline of 14%, with an increase in the percentage of poverty levels in 1998 that was significantly higher in urban areas than in rural areas (ADB report, 2001 in World Bank PAD 1999). Meanwhile, the economic growth dropped steeply from 7.5% p.a. in 1996 to 4.9% p.a. in 1997, and further collapsed to -13% p.a. in 1998 (Witoelar 2000: np).

Overview of bottom-up approaches in urban poverty alleviation strategies

While urban poverty is increasingly recognized as an issue, the appropriate policy response is less easily found. Indeed, there is much literature on urban poverty but little on its reduction (Amis and Racodit 1995; Anonym 1995).

Poverty reduction strategies: Top-down vs bottom-up approaches

According to Satterthwaite (2003), there are two contrasting ways of addressing poverty, which can be classified as top-down and bottom-up initiatives. On the one hand, development initiatives are directed by national governments and international agencies that characteristically have top-down administrative units, with centralised decision-making structures and very little

initiative emerging from local areas or lower tier of governments. Together with government agencies, these international organisations are also the main actors who implement development programmes and projects.⁷ With such heavily centralised organisation, many projects (such as those sponsored by the World Bank⁸) are often designed too ambitiously and are too complex. They also typically lack engagement with the local population and local knowledge, leading to problems of sustainability (Dharmawan 2000; Keare 2001; Parpart 2002; Satterthwaite 2003; UNDP 1998).

Another viewpoint sees top-down approaches as the legacy of modernisation theory and related to redistribution policies. In this view, top-down policies focus on capital and technology-intensive strategies to promote growth. In this policy, the community is expected to get a share of the growth that has been created in the centres ('trickle down effects'). This approach, indeed, is effective in a period of economic growth, but when economic growth declines it is unable to generate local innovative capacity and promote flexibility (Amdam, 1997; Rowland 1997; UNDP 1999).

Accordingly, bottom-up, self-reliant development has been increasingly prominent in the development initiatives. A bottom-up development is defined as an initiative from below. In the context of pov-

⁷ In these initiatives, by drawing on official data (usually woefully inadequate) and official definitions of poverty, "experts" (mostly foreigners from high-income nations) design the A to Z of a development initiative, including the identification of target groups and design policies to meet basic needs as defined by experts (Satterthwaite 2003).

⁸ Amongst the top-down projects is The World Bank Integrated Rural Development Program (IRDP) which was considered as a recipe for megafailure, more detail see Keare 2001.

erty, the initiatives are from the poor themselves, with limited infusion of new ideas from external change agents, including non-governmental or governmental agencies (Cohen and Uphoff 1980; Dharmawan 2000; Sen 1997). In this way, development "experts" become "facilitators" working with the poor rather than directing them. From this perspective, development cannot be "given" to the poor (Munck 1999). Meanwhile, Kulkarni & Rajan (1991) define local development with a bottom-up perspective as "an organized and articulated effort of a community to empower itself in the context and conditions of its collective existence" (in Amdam 1997:330). Detail of the bottom-up approaches and the role of external agents (the outsiders) presented in the box below:

that the 'locomotive' of economic development embraces smaller firms that can form a local network and engage with the global networks. More importantly, besides the economic measures, this approach is also concerned with establishing 'favourable social and cultural environments to imbue communities with the spirit of enterprise' (Amdam 1997:330). Oakley (1991:162) in his study of rural development stresses the importance of bottom-up approaches in programme activities. According to him, only through this sort of approach can the programme attain any meaningful and lasting success. The community's awareness of the necessity and effectiveness of their active participation in their own development will ensure that progress shall continue even

Box 2.1: Bottom-up approaches and the role of outsider

The bottom-up approaches see poverty as the deprivations faced by the poor that are experienced locally and thus need to be addressed with local changes. Poverty, therefore, is tackled by making resources available for responding to and supporting local democratic processes that stress the capacities of residents, the rights of all citizens to basic services, the rule of law, and accountable institutions. (Satterthwaite 2003:182).

Subsequently, target groups are encouraged to identify and utilise scarce resources available for them. The outside input are limited to the role of stimulants in a way that only assisting the groups in more effectively utilising their own assets (Munck 1999). Thus, "In no way shall the beneficiaries become dependent upon programme itself for financial or bureaucratic survival" (OXFAM, Indonesia Project 161 in Oakley 1991:162).

In contrast to the trickle down effect, with this approach, local communities are understood as having the ability to create their own jobs. Also, it is assumed

after the formalised project ends.⁹

In summary, a bottom-up approach places a greater emphasis on the self-sufficiency of the target group by nurturing

⁹ In his study, Oakley (and also Cernea (1992)) refer to participation or participatory development as bottom-up approaches. Participatory development, indeed, must be seen as "a means to an end as it initiates an empowerment process and allows those affected by a project to assume responsibility for designing initiatives, implementing them and - with this control - maintaining high levels of sustainability by creating autonomy" (UNDP 1999: np). By this definition, Oakley's and Cernea's arguments above are justified.

their enthusiasm and capabilities. It demands attention to local knowledge and accumulated wisdom, respectful partnership and participatory practice that will empower the poor so they can prescribe their own development problems, goals and solutions (Freedman 2000 & Friedman 1992 in Parpart 2002). From this perspective, Parpart (2002) argues that participation and empowerment are the essential building blocks for grassroots, people oriented transformative development.

This paper argues that any development initiatives or more specifically any grassroots developments that create opportunities for the poor to actively participate and make their own decision to move themselves out of poverty constitute a bottom-up approach. These developments include participatory development, community empowerment, community participation, self-help development, community driven development, community based development or any others based on the notion of active participation and empowerment.¹⁰ Ultimately, although it is acknowledged that the meanings of partici-

pation, empowerment and bottom-up are far from identical, in the development practice these notions, have often been used equally and thus the differences are blurred (Sen 1997)¹¹.

The use of social/local institutions and facilitation process within the bottom-up approaches

The move towards bottom-up approaches has resulted in a re-assessment of the target audience of development projects, which is now one of the dominant characteristics of many bottom-up initiatives. This involves reliance upon collective actions or groups as the basic unit for development projects to break their isolation and build strengths that are easier to identify and to allow public conflict resolution mechanism (Cleaver 1999; Oakley 1991; Rahman 1995; Sen 1997). These groups are formed for two reasons. First it is intended as a receiving mechanism, in which it is formed by the command of local officials for receiving inputs that projects wish to diffuse. Second, it is intended as social action, in which groups are formed to forge social and economic

¹⁰ These notions/terms have emerged in the development lexicon with goals that often overlap each other and are difficult to distinguish. Although this paper does not suggest that all these notions have the same meaning, as each indeed has special characteristic as well as there are differences in one or more aspect, for analysis of this paper, all these notions/terms are categorized as the same namely under the 'umbrella' of bottom-up approaches since they allow the beneficiaries, i.e. the poor to actively participate and make their own decisions to move themselves out of poverty.

¹¹ Specifically, Sen (1997:1) argues: "In the lexicon of poverty alleviation, participation, bottom-up approaches, and empowerment are the buzzwords of the day. Originating in a language of critique of the dominant development paradigms of the 1960's and 1970's, they have now become part of the mainstream, used equally "although perhaps not with the same meanings) by multilateral and bilateral development agencies, governments, and organizations of civil society. Inevitably, as is perhaps bound to happen when social actors with widely varying ideologies, approaches, and practices grope towards a common set of concepts, there is considerable lack of clarity, even confusion about what these words really mean".

link between the members and help develop solidarity as the basis for actions to move out of poverty as well as to ensure individual accountability (Oakley 1991; Sen 1997; UNDP 1993). These collective actions grow and involve various forms and degrees of mutual cooperation amongst the members in order to promote their economic position more quickly than would be possible on an individual basis (Rahman 1995).

Another increasing tendency in bottom-up initiatives is the existence of a facilitation process to assist the collective activities above. Even though in some cases participation can be generated spontaneously within the beneficiaries (Rahman 1993), often it cannot just "happen". Instead, it depends on mobilisation through the facilitation process. In such process, it should be emphasised that being facilitators, development workers need to understand that they are outsiders who cannot develop the poor by themselves. Rather, they should understand the community and then assist, encourage or stimulate them to search for solutions (and not ready made solution) (Botes and van Rensburg 2000; Cernea 1992; Clever 1999; Oakley 1999). While not ignoring the benefits gained, the use of social institutions/groups as well as development workers to facilitate such groups within bottom-up initiatives may lead to the dependence of individuals on both their

groups and the development workers and in turn may be against the release of individual own initiatives (Rahman 1993).

Constraints to the bottom-up approaches in the urban poverty alleviation strategies

As previously argued, there is no escaping the fact that real bottom-up development requires enormous work and patience and thus a long-term commitment (Mitlin and Thomson 1995; Moser 1989). Crucially, while the arguments in favour of bottom-up approaches are convincing¹², many theorists question their value in practice (Botchway 2001; Cohen and Uphof 1980; Dudley 1993 in Gregory 2000; Oakley 1991). Dudley (1993), for instance, claims that "community participation may have won the war of words but beyond rhetoric its success is less evident" (cited in Gregory 2000: 2). Indeed, the translation of the intrinsically good conceptual underpinning of participatory approaches often is not consistent with the impact (Botes and van Rensburg 2000; Clever 1999; Oakley 1991).

There seems to be a belief that once people are "empowered," development automatically becomes both achievable and sustainable (Botchway 2001: 135). Indeed, regardless of the various definition of the concept, concern with participation has been so popular that one can hardly be against the concept and promot-

¹² The emergence of bottom-up approaches, which again carry the idea of participation and empowerment in the development practice, is undoubtedly not a bad thing. A long list of justifications for this approach can indeed be drawn from the facts such as that they open space for citizenry (or in the poverty context: the poor) to be a part of the cultural and socio-economic structures of society (Botchway 2001) or a fact that they ensure greater efficiency and effectiveness as well as contributing to the process of democratisation and sustainable development interventions (Clever 1999).

ing participation becomes good by its definition (Cohen and Uphoff 1980). This inherent goodness of the notion of participation has often made it an alternative to the structural reforms necessary to facilitate genuine social change. Accordingly, the focus on participation is often narrow and neglects contextual issues that remain untouchable by the beneficiaries (Botchway 2001; Cleaver 1999). Indeed, there are a plethora of factors, which can hamper and even constrain the promotion of bottom-up approaches. These factors can be classified as external and internal constraints. External constraints comprise factors residing outside of the beneficiary community but that can inhibit or prevent meaningful participation, while internal factors include factors located within the beneficiary community. A factor, indeed, can be external, internal or both (Botes and van Rensburg, 2000)

Drawing from the work of Botes and van Rensburg (2000) on their study of urban development projects as well as the work of Botchway (2001), Cleaver (1999), Mitlin (2003), Moser (1989), Oakley (1991) and many other relevant studies, this paper identifies eleven constraints to the implementation of a bottom-up approach to urban poverty alleviation at the community level.

The first nine factors were based on Botes and van Rensburg (2000) external and internal factors, which provide a clear picture of the complex constraints on such initiatives at the community level. These external factors are: the paternalistic role of development professionals, the prescriptive role of the state, the adornment of success, and the tendency of selective participation. The internal factors comprise; conflicting interest groups, gate-

keeping by local elites/leaders, and disinterest within the target group. Finally two factors, which are both external and internal, are enumerated: excessive pressure for immediate results and the hard issues or techno-financial bias. These factors are reinforced in Njoh's study (2002), drawing from a case study of Cameroon self help projects. The last two constraints that this paper identified that are both internal and external factors are financial constraints and constraints as a result of the culture of corruption, collusion and nepotism (Locally known in its acronym KKN stands for *Korupsi, Kolusi and Nepotism*). It is also important to note that all of these factors interrelate, which according to Moser (1989), has also contributed to the complexity of the problem. All of these factors will be outlined in the rest of this paper.

External Factors

1. The paternalistic role of development professionals

Although "bottom-up" is a buzzword today, the characteristics of top-down approaches still prevail in most development practice. This is shown by the externally induced development projects that are common worldwide. As is typical of top-down approaches, the outsiders (the bureaucrats or foreign experts) dominate the decision-making process and therefore under-value the capacities of local people to make their own decisions as well as to determine their own priorities (Botes and van Rensburg 2000; Moser 1989; Njoh 2002; Satterthwaite 2003). Moreover, many bottom-up projects, are not a genuine effort to empower communities to choose development options freely, but

rather an effort to sell predetermined proposals in which participation processes start only after projects have already been designed. The process, therefore, is often not an attempt to ascertain the outcome and priorities, but rather to gain acceptance for an already assembled package. Therefore, the bottom-up approach here is nothing more than an attempt to convince beneficiaries what is best for them (Botes and van Rensburg 2000).

2. Prescriptive role of the state

Like most activities in society, development projects, especially those, which promote a bottom-up approach, are very political. As Cohen and Uphoff (1980: 228) argue, participation is "inescapably political" as it is likely to alter the use and distribution of resources in society. Such alterations are subject to the varied value judgements people make about it. This constraint is best explained by what Oakley (1991) describes as structural and administrative constraints, referring to the centralised political environment. Clearly, participation cannot be expected to flourish in a centrally planned country. In such circumstance, a true bottom-up approach would be a threat to the status quo. Thus, it is often used by the government to maintain existing clientalist power relations rather than improving conditions for the poor. The main aim indeed is ensuring the silence of the poor (Botes and van Rensburg 2000; Moser 1989).

Moreover, administrators often who retain control over decision making as well as resource allocation and then suddenly have to act as supporting agencies, leading them to have negative attitudes towards

bottom-up approaches. A bottom up initiative may confront not only political constraints and vested interests, but also bureaucratic and cultural impediments, such as differing value systems among stakeholders or even within the same stakeholder. Empowerment anti-poverty programmes often have to face the mindset of top-down decision-making and control that is built into government (Cernea 1992; Mitlin 2003; Oakley 1991; Sen 1997). However, there are also cases where bureaucrats devote themselves to the efficiency of a participatory endeavour (Cernea 1992; Moser 1989; Oakley 1991) and in some cases see it as a way of coopting the community forces that might have fought for rights and more resources from the state (Petras 1997)

3. The adornment of development successes

There is a tendency to overemphasise development successes more than the failures. Success stories are always well quantified, documented and communicated, while the failures which are an important part of the learning process are often off the record and therefore opportunities to learn from the past are often lost (Botes and van Rensburg 2000; Njoh 2002). The successes of a program or projects are often assessed against predetermined targets or objectives. Targets that are often imposed by the officials or implementers of a program can cause many problems, such as manipulative data where officials often embellish data on a project's achievement just to show the success of their work (Rahman 1993).

4. Selective participation

There is also a tendency for project beneficiaries to exclude themselves or be excluded from the development process. Accordingly, the voices of self appointed individuals are erroneously perceived as reflecting the views or the perspectives of the poor (Botes and van Rensburg 2000; Njoh 2002). Very often, partners of a development projects involve the most visible and vocal, wealthier, more articulate and educated groups rather than the less obvious partners (Mitlin 2003). The economic and social disadvantages of poverty often lead to the poorest being missed as targets of poverty reduction programs. The poorest citizen may struggle for inclusion, particularly if there is competition from higher income groups for scarce resources (Botes and van Rensburg 2000; Mitlin 2003). Although, poverty alleviation programs are intended to target the poorest; in their implementation they often target the relatively better-off poor. It has been argued that some programs or projects cannot touch the poorest of the poor. This is particularly pertinent for a micro-credit/microfinance program. In such programs the ability to repay loans is important to promote economic sustainability.

Internal Factors

5. Conflicting interest groups

As previously discussed, the poor are neither homogeneous nor face the same problems (Dharmawan 2000). In such heterogeneous communities, people frequently withdraw from participation due to divisions of language, tenure, income, gender, age or politics. Competition among community based organizations and other

popular movements for access to scarce development resources and power is a major constraint preventing genuine participation. Indeed, development is always the result of decisions, which require choices about whose needs are to enjoy priority. Some interests can be accommodated, therefore, only at the expense of others. In this way, conflicts may arise in situations where some groups may feel neglected in decisions affecting their lives and in turn enhance the possibility of different interest groups within a single community opposing each other. Moreover, what is perceived as negative by one interest group can very often have a positive meaning for another (Botes and van Rensburg 2000). As Walsh (1995) also claims, initiatives from below can be constituted as a multidimensional process, including social, economic and political processes through which society seeks to achieve a range of goals and often contested priorities. These are likely to be in conflict at times (in Amdam 1997).

6. Gate-keeping by local elites/leaders

It is commonly argued that support from local elites/leaders enhances the success of a development initiative; however, having a role as mediators, these elite can easily insert themselves between the beneficiaries and the project. In this way, local elites may thwart active involvement by beneficiaries because it threatens their control. Thus, there is always the danger that decision-making at the community-level may fall into the hands of a small and self-perpetuating clique, which may act in its own interests with disregard for the wider community (Botes and van Rensburg 2000: 49). The grassroots

organisations that seem to represent the needs and interests of the urban poor may instead be dominated by self-interested elite leaders who tend to form clientalist relationships (Mitlin 2002, 2003) or a patron-client network (Ngau 1987) with local politicians and officials.

Local elites vary from area to area. Typically, these elites have close links to power as well as information channels. They comprise formal leaders, namely those who appointed as the head or staff of a formal organization within community (such as administrative officials, within Indonesian context this can include Chief of neighbourhood or household unit (RTs/RWs), the chief of ward (*kelurahan*): *Lurah* and his officials) and informal leaders who are not in any formal position, but are considered or respected as leaders by the community, such as religious leaders, ethnic leaders and people with certain types of occupation, such as doctors and teachers or relatively rich people. Experience shows that initiatives and leadership will often come from people with higher social status (Moser 1989; Mitlin 2002, 2003). Together with the selective participant factor above, elite domination may also exaggerate difficulties for a development initiative in reaching the poorest.

7. Disinterest within the target group

Willingness of a project's beneficiaries to become involved is a key factor for the success of development initiatives. There are indeed many factors that cause people to withdraw. Amongst the reasons are past experience of involvement where there were unfulfilled expectations, the absence of a social tradition supportive of participation; inadequate technology inhib-

iting proper service delivery; the community's perception of the government as a satisfactory medium; and the government's reluctance to build participation into their project designs (Botes and van Rensburg 2000). However, people will participate if they recognize their own interests in a program. This economic rationality, coupled with social norms affects people's intention to participate. Indeed, good intentions to encourage participation fail due to inability of the programs to take organizational steps to translate the desirable participation into practice or to not provide economic gains to the intended beneficiaries who wished to participate (Cernea 1992).

Moreover, social and cultural constraints may also pose a great challenge for bottom-up initiatives. In some cases, there is a mentality of dependence amongst the poor towards their local elites or local leaders (Botes and van Rensburg 2000; Oakley 1991; Rowland 1997). Moreover, a lack of leadership and organisational skill amongst the poor also greatly contribute to their willingness to participate. In some cases, it is also easier and beneficial for individuals not to participate, to avoid being bound by certain rules within the group (Clever 1999).

Factors, which are both internal and external.

8. Hard issue bias

This factor relates to the perception that 'hard' issues including technology, finance and physical material are more important for the successful implementation of poverty intervention than 'soft' matters such as participation, empowerment, effectiveness and institutional

development. The underlying assumption of such views is that social and cultural features of the so-called soft issues are ephemeral, intangible and unnecessarily time-consuming compared to the more easily managed 'hard issues'. This inevitably leads to a technical bias, which neglects the fact that inappropriate social processes can destroy the most noble development endeavor (Botes and van Rensburg 2000; Moser 1989).

9. Excessive pressures for immediate results

Similar to the authorities of a development initiative that tend to overemphasise the imperatives of delivery (products), the beneficiaries value more of such results too. Accordingly, there is a tendency to neglect other laudable objectives such as the process of the beneficiaries' participation. Moreover, pressures imposed by abundant targets on the project's implementers often encourages them to complete project related task or portions thereof by themselves as opposed to allowing the community people to complete them (Botes and van Rensburg 2000; Njoh 2002; Rahman 1993)

10. Financial constraints

Although it appears in some of the literature, this factor is not a major focus in either the work of Botes and van Rensburg (2000) or Njoh (2002). However, it practically can be a major constraint. Although bottom-up approaches may actually save programmes funds and

time by cutting down on waste and corruption (Sen 1997),¹³ it is often assumed that bottom up approaches cost too much time and money (Cernea 1992; Oakley 1991; UNDP 1999). It has been claimed that promoting effective local participation can greatly add to the costs of a development activity and therefore its benefits have to be carefully calculated (Cernea 1992; Oakley 1991; UNDP 1998). As Moser (1989) maintains, in bottom-up initiatives (specifically those conducted by non government organisation (NGOs)) funds acquired are most frequently spent on payment of professionally trained staff and local personnel to assist the community rather than for the community itself (Moser 1989).

Opponents of this approach argue that the processes of participation are inappropriate and a luxury in situations of poverty and thus it is hard to justify spending on such a process where people need to be fed and their livelihoods secured (UNDP, 1998).

Meanwhile, for financial reasons, any community development effort on voluntary basis tends to involve those who are relatively better off but also are not necessarily representative of the community (Moser 1989).

These financial issues appear to be the main constraints for a bottom-up poverty reduction strategy, especially for developing countries (such as Indonesia) where the poverty programmes depend on external funding and where municipal finance is deficient (Mitlin 2003).

¹³ Waste here relates to complex and slow bureaucratic within top down procedures, while corruption relate to the way that all stakeholders responsible to uphold accountability including transparency of the use of funds.

11. The culture of KKN (Indonesia: Korupsi, Kolusi and Nepotism) or Corruption, Collusion, and Nepotism

The strong roots of the culture of KKN that has become an element of daily life in Indonesia is widely known. As Johnson and Sheehy (1996) maintain, the Indonesian regulatory environment is characterized by bribery, kickbacks, and corruption. Many regulations are applied arbitrarily, and bribes may be necessary to receive an 'exemption' from these regulations (in Feng Yi et al. 2002).¹⁴ This chronic KKN, indeed has paralyzed Indonesia's productive capacity, resulting in a situation where institutions are used for personal gain rather than development (Almonte in Firman 2002). Ironically, there is also a tendency in Indonesia to view KKN as an inevitable step to success in obtaining permits and better service (Server, 1996).

In accordance with the Structural Adjustment Programs (SAP) in Third World countries, Rahman (1995) argued that public sector development efforts consist largely of bureaucratic and technocratic approaches to the implementation of projects and programs in a culture of unbridled corruption. This further benefit those directly involved with the processing and implementation of these projects and programs much more than the people at the grassroots. In poverty alleviation programs, more specifically, there is an unfavorable image of 'project culture', where the goodwill and willing-

ness to cooperate expressed by officials of the development agencies will only be significant if the project give them a chance to gain more private benefits necessary to augment their private standing (Shepherd in Dharmawan 2000: 9).

Bottom-up based urban poverty alleviation strategies

Experience with urban poverty strategies has placed communities in a critical point of urban development processes with an emphasis on building the strengths and capacities of the urban poor themselves. The strategy is focussed on an aim of enhancing the assets base of the urban poor that entails strengthening grassroots organisations, transforming relations with the state and developing new alternatives to conventional urban development (from top down to a more bottom-up development). Indeed effective poverty reduction strategies require locally driven processes that develop and strengthen local organisations to support community led development as well as supporting the development of accountable, effective city and municipal local governments (Mitlin 2002, 2003; Satterthwaite 2001).

The poverty alleviation strategies within Indonesia's urban context

Despite the significant number of Indonesian living in poverty, the goal of poverty reduction was not included in the first five rounds of the Five Year Development Plan

¹⁴ Specifically, the KKN can take the form of obtaining licenses and career posts, commission for contracts, the premium to pay (compensate) from the breach of laws, the payment of extra administrative fees to speed up administration steps and the provision of services (Server, 1996).

(Pelita I to V). Only in 1994, did the government explicitly target poverty reduction and eventually the elimination of poverty as a development goal in its Five Year Development Plan VI (Pelita VI) (Suryahadi and Sumarto 2003). More importantly, after years of being left off the poverty strategies agenda, the 1997 economic crisis has forced the government to begin to view urban poverty as a problem that is as serious as its rural counterpart. This was clearly stated by The Indonesian Minister of Settlements and Regional Development, Erna Witoelar (2000: np):

Begin in the 21st century with a search for new social and economic paradigms, we all understand that if pressing problems of urban poverty can not be overcome, it will not only diminish the physical quality of life, but will also lead to deterioration of the whole fabric of urban society. In turn, this will affect social and political stability, economic productivity and environmental sustainability.

Meanwhile, a recent report on poverty reduction strategies in Indonesia (World Bank 2001) focuses on a governance improvement agenda that includes: free flow of information to the poor regarding their entitlements and obligations; a voice for the poor in decisions regarding allocation of public resources, program design and implementation; and accountability of decision makers for every stage of public programs and project planning, budgeting, implementation and monitoring, all moves towards a more bottom-up approach. As Witoelar (2000) also acknowledges, the government needs to increase

capacity in facilitating participatory processes involving the poor themselves since in the past the government was better at working *for* the people, and rather clumsy in working *with* the people.

The same report proposes two areas of action for poverty reduction. First, it proposes actions directed towards raising the income of the poor. These would include, among others, economic empowerment of the poor and poverty focused public expenditures. Second, it proposes actions directed towards effective provision of core public services. These would include putting users first in all decisions regarding provision of public services; focusing on basic health, education and infrastructure services; and developing safety nets for the poorest to cope with shocks. Although these two themes are not specifically concerned with urban poverty, these indeed have great relevance to urban poverty.

Meanwhile, the vision of Indonesia's urban poverty eradication has been designed consistent with the policy of decentralized development and people empowerment, to ensure that the process of decision making and implementation of urban development involves not just the government, but also civil society and the private sector as well as other stakeholders (Witoelar 2000). One of the poverty alleviation strategies around these themes is the Urban Poverty Project (Program Penanggulangan Kemiskinan Perkotaan (P2KP) which has finished to be implemented in Indonesia.

Conclusion

This paper highlights that although it is difficult to draw a clear distinction between

urban poverty and rural poverty, there are aspects of urban poverty that are compounded by the nature of the urban environment. This paper has also discussed the notion of bottom-up approaches that entail grassroots developments to create opportunities for the poor to actively participate in and make their own decisions to move themselves out of poverty. This then is followed by some factors that constrain their implementation at the community level. These are the external factors: the paternalistic role of development professionals, the prescriptive role of the state, the adornment of success, and the tendency of selective participation; the internal factors: conflicting interest groups, gate-keeping by local elites/leaders, and disinterest within the target group; and lastly four factors are both external and internal: the excessive pressures for im-

mediate results, the hard issues or technofinancial bias, the financial constraints and the constraints as a result of the culture of corruption, collusion and nepotism (the KKN).

The bottom line of such constraints is that, despite the inherent goodness of a bottom-up initiative, clearly it always invites reactions either from the beneficiaries (internal factors) who regard it as a new idea; and officials (external factors) who may regard it as a threat. Each section has subsequently been followed by a discussion of the Indonesian context that has finished up with explanations for the shift towards recognition of pressing problems of urban poverty in the government's development agenda as well as the move to a more bottom-up approach, which entails development *with* rather than *for* people.

Daftar Pustaka

- Amdam, R., "Empowerment Planning in Local Communities: Some Experiences from Combining Communicative and Instrumental Rationality in Local Planning Norway", *International Planning Studies*, 2(3):329-345, 1997.
- Amis, P., "Making Sense of Urban Poverty", *Environment and Urbanization*, 7(1):145-157, 1995.
- Amis, P., "Attacking Poverty: But What Happened to Urban Poverty and Development", *Journal of International Development*, 13: 535-360, 2001.
- Amis, P. and Rakodit C., "Urban Poverty: Concept, Characteristics and Policies", *Habitat International*, 19(4):403-405, 1995.
- Anonym, "Urban Poverty-From Understanding to Action", *Environment and Urbanization* 7(2):3-10, 1995.
- Baharoglu, D. and Kessides, C., "Chapter 16, Urban Poverty", [Available at- http://poverty.worldbank.org/files/4418_chap16.pdf] (Accessed 10 January 2004).
- Botchway, K., "Paradox of Empowerment: Reflections on a Case Study from Northern Ghana", *World Development* 29 (1): 135-153, 2001.
- Botes, L., and van Rensburg, D., "Community Participation in Development: Nine Plagues and Twelve Commandments", *Community Development Journal*, 35(1): 41-58, 2000.

- Cernea, Michael M, *The Building Blocks of Participation: Testing Bottom-up Planning*, the World Bank Discussion Papers 166, the World Bank, Washington D.C., 1992.
- Cleaver, F., "Paradoxes of Participation: Questioning Participatory Approaches to Development", *Journal of International Development* 11: 597-612, 1999.
- Cohen, J. M. and Uphoff, N. T., "Participation's Place in Rural Development: Seeking Clarity through Specificity", *World Development*, 8: 213-235, 1980.
- Dhanani S., and Islam, I., "Poverty, Vulnerability and Social Protection in a Period of Crisis: The Case of Indonesia", *World Development*, 30(7): 1211-1231, 2002.
- Dharmawan. A. H., *Poverty, Powerlessness, and Poor People Empowerment: A Conceptual Analysis with Special Reference to the Case of Indonesia*, Institute Pertanian Bogor Press (Bogor: The Indonesian University of Agriculture Press, 2000).
- Fay nd, *Urban Poverty in Latin America*, [Available at- <http://www.worldbank.org/urban/poverty/docs/iw/fay.pdf>] (Accessed 1 April 2004).
- Feng, Yi et.al, "Indonesia's Economic Crisis and Dilemma: Contradiction of Two Kinds of Freedom", in Kuotsa Tom Liou (ed), *Managing Economic Development in Asia, From Economic Miracle to Financial Crisis* (Praeger, Westpory: 2002).
- Firman, T., "Indonesian Cities under the "Krismon", A Great "Urban Crisis" in South-east Asia", *Cities*, 16 (2):69-82, 1999.
- Firman, T., "Urban Development in Indonesia, 1990-2001: From the Boom to the Early Reform Era through the Crisis", *Habitat International*, 26:229-249, 2002.
- Keare, D. H., "Learning to Clap: Reflection on Top-down Versus Bottom-up Development", *Human Organization*, 6(2): 159-165, 2001.
- Kumorotomo, W., *Poverty Alleviation Programs during the Economic Crisis in Indonesia: National versus Local Pictures*, A paper presented in the International Seminar on the Local Government Capacity Building and Poverty Alleviation Policies Within the Framework of Decentralisation: The Case of the Philippines and Indonesia, October 22-23, 2001, Nagoya University, [Available at-http://www-new.gsid.nago u.ac.jp/user/prof/p2kimurah/kimura_homepage/Kumoro01.3Poverty_Alleviation.pdf] (Accessed 1 November 2003).
- Lok Dessalien, R., *Review of Poverty Concepts and Indicators*, [Availableathttp://www.undp.org/poverty/publications/poverty_reduction_series.htm] (Accessed 1 February 2004).
- Mills, E. S. and Pernia, E.M., *Urban Poverty in Asia, A Survey of Critical issues*, (Hongkong-New York: Oxford University Press, 1994).
- Mitlin D., "Civil Society and Urban poverty: Examining Complexity", *Environment and Urbanization*, 13(2):151-174, 2001.
- Mitlin, D., *The Economic and Social Processes Influencing the Level and Nature of Chronic Poverty in Urban Areas*, [Available at-<http://www.chronicpoverty.org/pdfs/mitlin.pdf>] (Accessed 31 March 2004).
- Mitlin, D., "Addressing Urban Poverty through Strengthening Assets", *Habitat international*, 27:393-406, 2003a.

- Mitlin, D. and Thompson, J., "Participatory Approaches in Urban Areas: Strengthening Civil Society or Reinforcing the Status Quo?", *Environment and Urbanization* 7(1): 231-250, 1995.
- Moser, C. N., "Community Participation in Urban Projects in the Third World", *Progress in Planning*, 32(2), 73-133, 1989.
- Moser, C.N., "The Asset Vulnerability Framework: Reassessing Urban Poverty Reduction Strategies", *World Development* 26(1):1-19, 1998.
- Munck, R., "Deconstructing Development Discourses: of Impasses, Alternatives and Politics", in Ronaldo Munck and Denis O'Hearn (ed), *Critical Development Theory: Contributions to a New Paradigm* (London, New York: Zed Book, London New York, 1999).
- Ngau, P.M., "Tension in Empowerment: The Experience of the Harambee (Self-Help) Movement in Kenya", *Economic Development and Cultural Change*, 35(3):523-538, 1987.
- Njoh, A.J., "Barriers to Community Participation in Development Planning: Lessons from the Muntengene (Cameroon) Self-Help Water Project", *Community Development Journal*, 37(3): 233-248, 2002.
- Oakley, P. 1991 *Projects with People: The Practice of Participation in Rural Development* (Geneva, Switzerland: International Labour Office, 1991).
- Parpart, J., 2002, "Lessons from the Field: Rethinking Empowerment, Gender and Development from a Post-(Post-?) Development Perspective", in Kriemild Saunders (ed) *Feminist Post-Development Thought: Rethinking Modernity, Post-Colonialism & Representation* (London: Zed Books, 1991).
- Petras, J., "Imperialisme and NGOs in Latin America", *Monthly Review*, 49(7):10-27, 1997.
- Rahman, M. A., 1993, *People's self development* (London: Zed Books, 1993).
- Rahman, M. A., "Participatory Development: Toward Liberation or Co-optation?", in Craig, G. and Mayo, M (eds.), *Community Empowerment: A Reader in Participation and Development* (London and New Jersey: Zed Books, 1995).
- Rowlands, J., "Empowerment Examined", in Deborah Eade, *Development and Social Diversity Practice* (Oxford: Oxfam-UK and Ireland, 1996).
- Rowlands, J., *Questioning Empowerment, Working with Women in Honduras* (Oxford: Oxfam-UK Ireland, 1997).
- Satterthwaite, D., "Urban Poverty: Reconsidering Its Scale and Nature." *IDS Bulletin* 28(2):9-22, 1997.
- Satterthwaite, D., "Reducing Urban Poverty: Constraints on the Effectiveness of Aid Agencies and Development Banks, Some Suggestions for Change", *Environment and urbanization*, 13(1): 137-157, 2001.
- Satterthwaite, D., "The Millennium Development Goals and Urban Poverty Reduction: Great Expectations and Nonsense Statistics", *Environment and urbanization*, 15(2):181-190, 2003.
- Sen, A., 1999, *Development as Freedom*, Oxford University Press, Oxford.
- Sen G., *Empowerment as an approach to poverty*, Background paper for Human

- Development Report 1997, [Available at- http://www.hsph.harvard.edu/Organizations/healthnet/HUPapers/97_07.pdf] (Accessed 1 August 2003).
- Server, O.B., "Corruption: A Major Problem for Urban Management - Some Evidence from Indonesia", *Habitat International*, 20(1):23-41, 1996.
- Suryahadi, A., and Sumarto, S., "Poverty and Vulnerability in Indonesia before and after the Economic Crisis", *Asian Economic Journal* 17(1):45-64, 2003.
- Suryahadi, A., and Sumarto, S., 2003a, 'Poverty Mapping Efforts in Indonesia', [Available [http://www.unescap.org/pdd/projects/pov_map/5b Indonesia%20Poverty%20Mapping%20-%20Main%20Report.doc](http://www.unescap.org/pdd/projects/pov_map/5b%20Indonesia%20Poverty%20Mapping%20-%20Main%20Report.doc)] (Accessed 10 January 2004).
- Suselo, H., and van der Hoff, R., "Emerging Institutional Forms for Urban Management in Developing countries: Institutionalizing the Integrated Urban Infrastructure Development Programme Approach in Indonesia", in Meine Peter van Dijk, Marike Noordhoek and Emiel Wegelin (ed) *Governing Cities New Institutional Forms in Developing Countries and Transitional Economies* (London: ITDG Publishing, 2002).
- Tambunan, T., *Urban Poverty and Social Safety Nets in Indonesia*, Silver Platter Information, [Available at-<http://www.gdnet.org/fulltext/tambunan.pdf>] (Accessed 15 March 2004).
- United Nations Development Program (UNDP), *Human Development Report*, Oxford University Press, New York, Chapter 5, 1993.
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP), 1999, 'Participation and empowerment', UNDP Sustainable Livelihoods Unit, [Available at http://www.undp.org/sl/Overview/participation_and_empowerment.htm] (Accessed, 15 December 2003).
- United Nations Development Programme (UNDP) - Civil Society Organizations and Participation Programme (CSOPP), 1998, *Empowering People - A guidebook to participation* [Available at- <http://www.undp.org/csopp/CSO/NewFiles/-docemppeople1.html>] (Accessed 15 December 2003).
- Witoelar, E. 2000, *Urban Poverty In Indonesia: The Impact of the Crisis, and Government's Response*, Paper Presented at the World Bank Urban Forum: "Urban Poverty in the 21st Century", April 3-5, Chantilly, Virginia, USA [Available at- <http://www.worldbank.org/html/fpd/urban/forum2000/papers/indonesia.pdf>] (Accessed 1 December 2003).
- World Bank nd, Urban Poverty, [Available at- (<http://worldbank.int/poverty/strategies/chapters/urban/urbpresn.pdf>)] (Accessed 15 November 2003).
- World Bank nd-a, 'Prologue to Rural and Urban Poverty' [Available at- <http://www.worldbank.org/poverty/strategies/chapters/prologue.htm>](Accessed 15 November 2003).
- World Bank, Project Appraisal Document (PAD) on Urban Poverty Project Indonesia, 1999, [Available; [http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer/WDSP/IB/1999/09/14/000094946_99051205324528/Rendered/PDF/multi_page.pdf](http://www-wds.worldbank.org/servlet/WDSContentServer?WDSPIB/1999/09/14/000094946_99051205324528/Rendered/PDF/multi_page.pdf)] (Accessed 31 October 2003).
- Wratten, E., "Conceptualizing Urban Poverty", *Environment & Urbanization*, 7 (1): 11-33, 1995.