

# PARTICIPATORY GOVERNANCE AND IMPLEMENTATION OF POOR EMPOWERMENT POLICY IN INDONESIA

Nurkaidah<sup>1</sup>, Didik Iskandar<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Public Administration Bosowa University  
E-mail: [nurkaidah1963@gmail.com](mailto:nurkaidah1963@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup> Student of Doctoral Program Public Administration Hasanuddin University  
E-mail: [dik.iskandar27@gmail.com](mailto:dik.iskandar27@gmail.com)

## ABSTRACT

*Participatory governance broadly defines the governance approach as 'institutions and processes', both formally and informally. Poverty is a global issue, at least a disturbing phenomenon for developing countries today, and Indonesia is no exception. This study aims to build a participatory governance model in the implementation of poverty alleviation in Indonesia. The research method used is descriptive qualitative with data collection techniques, direct observation at the location, conducting interviews with several informants, and documentation. For data management techniques used data reduction, data display, and drawing conclusions. This research is located in Makassar City, covering three divisions of poverty clusters, namely the city cluster, the coastal cluster, and the hinterland cluster. In practice, this model of implementing participatory governance-based poverty reduction policies shows conditions in TKPKD activities that are considered not yet maximal, seen from the concept of participatory governance empowerment, which consists of Deliberation, Action, Monitoring, Centralized Coordination and Power, School of Democracy, and Outcomes.*

**Keywords:** *Participatory Governance, Policy Implementation, poor empowerment*

## INTRODUCTION

Participation, openness in public services, effectiveness and efficiency, and justice are integrated values to realize " *integrate public governance* " in public administration (Godsell, 2006). These values are also in line with public demands in creating accountability, responsiveness and accessibility which are the most appropriate criteria for measuring "democratic state administration" (Albrow, 1989). more active and proactive in solving public problems. Sal a mon emphasized that " *The heart of this revolution has been a fundamental transformation not just in the scope and scale of government action, but in its basic forms. A massive proliferation has occurred in the tools public action, in the instrument or means used to address public problems*" (Sal a mon, 200 2 ). He called it the new governance ( *new governance* ).

Issues related to *governance* in the study of public administration today have become a concern and are always interesting to study, especially in 'public policy' which is the output as well as the core of public administration (Denhardt, 1995). The presence of a *governance approach* in the realm of public administration is an answer

to the reality which shows that the public policy process no longer relies on the government but requires the role of other actors outside the government. As discussed by Chhotray and Stoker (2009) that '*the governance paradigm is about the central importance of how the interaction of government and non-government actors are guided and directed in collective decision making*'.

In the realm of public policy, these developments have resulted in a wider field of policy that allows non-state actors to be involved. In a further development, the policy is defined as the result of the interaction of various actors with complex interests and strategies (Klijn & Koppenjan, 2000). In a context where the state is not the only *planning and implementing agency* for a public policy, the *steering function* of complex actor relationships in formulating, making decisions and implementing public policies is very central. The strengthening demands of democratization and the pressure of globalization also make the study of public administration increasingly lose its phenomenon. The desire of the community to participate in government and development activities has led to the emergence of many new institutions in society. As a response to this phenomenon, encouraging '*a new context of governing*' or a new approach in the perspective of governance, namely *participatory governance*.

*Participatory governance* broadly defines governance approaches as '*institutions and processes*', both formally and informally. This approach creates a space for interaction between the state and other *stakeholders* who are affected by government policies (Mitlin, 2004). This diverse engagement has been regarded as '*a more flexible and democratic way of dealing with public problems*' (Fischer, 2006:19). Thus participatory governance is the embodiment of the core attributes of *governance theory* in its attempt to engage with real problems and seek practical solutions. Some of them are related to regional poverty reduction policies in Indonesia which are considered a fairly complicated problem or commonly referred to as a wicked problem, where the wicked problem is a problem that has a fairly high level of complexity to be overcome by Alwi, 2018). Poverty reduction policies are also a focus in several regions in Indonesia, one of which is Makassar City.

Makassar City is a new autonomous region in Indonesia, but shows a significant poverty reduction measure. Based on the table above, the poor population in Makassar City until 2018 reached 6.73 percent with a total of 8.82 thousand inhabitants of Makassar City being below the poverty line (Regional profile 2020) . This effort is quite significant in overcoming poverty in this area, but still requires

appropriate poverty reduction strategies so that poverty in this area can be overcome. In many cases, the handling of the problem of poverty in this country is still using the old ways that tend to be classified as conventional by taking a general concept approach, such as handling sectoral in nature or in the sense that in terms of intervening in poverty, the policies taken by the government are still partial in accordance with the areas- responsible field. So that the results obtained tend to have not been able to maximize due to the lack of synergy that prioritizes the pattern of participation in carrying out its policies. So that a more participatory approach is needed by involving many elements in order to get maximum results in dealing with the problem of poverty in Makassar City.

Based on the objective conditions and the proposed concept, a research related to the participatory governance model in the implementation of poverty reduction in Makassar City was conducted with the aim of building a *participatory governance model* in the implementation of poverty alleviation in Makassar City.

## **THEORITICAL REVIEW**

### **Participatory Governance as a Strategy of Poor Empowerment**

The presence of *participatory governance* is a form of anxiety from conventional policy practices . In line with the high intensity of encouragement for citizen participation and participation, public collaboration with the state is needed and made possible. *Participatory governance* was deemed necessary after the inability of the traditional state to address contemporary social problems (Fischer, 2006). *Participatory Governance* involves the community as a policy object in the problem solving process. A participatory governance approach to crime, for example, would involve local residents in the process of designing community policy programs (Yolanda and Campbell, 2011). Or a community health center may place patients on the Board of Directors because they have specialized knowledge of how the center can better serve them in terms of care (Cristie, 2010).

Even further the emphasis on the importance of *participatory governance* will reflect the original push for democratic forms of *participation* , meaning that participatory governance can lead to better citizens, better decisions and better government (Cornwall, 2004). :78; Mansbridge, 1999; Gaventa, 2002). Meanwhile Heller (2001) refers to participatory governance as a 'democratic version of decentralization', defined by increasing the scope and depth of participation of lower

groups in resource allocation. A core tenet of the *participatory governance approach* is a commitment to problem solving decentralization by local stakeholders, and the continuous adjustment of rules and policies informed by monitoring and feedback, or what may be termed "*learning by doing* ." In these two components of the new governance process, stakeholder participation ( stakeholders) plays an important role.

Archard Fung and Erik Olin Wright (2003) since they first introduced the term *participatory governance* in their article "*Thinking About Empowered Participatory Governance*" argue that strengthening participation is a progressive institutional reform strategy that will strengthen democratic practices both conceptually and empirically. Furthermore, Fung and Wright emphasize that *empowered participatory governance* is based on the values of democracy, deliberation and empowerment. Fung and Wright (2003) also offer three institutional designs as an effort to deepen the value of democracy and participation. All three are designed so that the principles of effective *participatory governance* can be adapted to the social and environmental conditions of the target group of the policy. After establishing the principles and offering institutional designs in *empowered participatory governance*, then Fung and Wright (2003) integrate into one node the *empowered participatory governance model* which is described in 6 (six) dimensions: *Deliberation* , *Action* , *Monitoring* , *Centralized Coordination and Power* , *School of Democracy* , and *Outcomes* .

### **Participatory Governance and Policy Implementation**

Participation in the context of policy implementation can be called *participatory implementation* . Nearly two decades ago, DeLeon and DeLeon (2002) identified a trend towards more discursive forms of policy implementation, one that recognized that there is a person whose behavior needs to be modified for policy implementation to be considered successful, and that some components may be more willing to adjust themselves with a new mandate if they are notified, and even more so if they agree to it before it is decided.

The thing that underlies this opinion is that Peter DeLeon ( 2002 ) considers that several cases in policy implementation have neglected their democratic roots, especially in the second generation of policy implementation approaches, namely the *top-down approach* which is more hierarchical and coercive. This is in contrast to the *bottom-up approach* which favors democratic principles. Jane Mansbridge (1980)

thoughtfully argues that directly or at the local level, democracy is a must in policy implementation where participation is the key.

Approaching participation with policy implementation conceptually would align policy implementation with the broader trend in policy science toward a greater emphasis on democratic ethos and citizen participation (Drzek and Torgerson 1993; Yanow 1996). A democratic approach to policy implementation includes a broad policy process framework to include consideration of policy formulation as a means to help define policy objectives by talking to affected parties well before the policy is officially adopted by policy makers (Nye, Zelikow, and King, 1997). ).

## **METHODS**

This research is located in Makassar City, covering three divisions of poverty clusters, namely the city cluster, the coastal cluster, and the hinterland cluster. This is done to comprehensively know the characteristics of poverty in Makassar City. The design or method used in this research is qualitative. The use of qualitative methods to find out in depth the phenomenon and the stakeholders involved in poverty alleviation in Makassar City. Determination of informants in this study was determined *purposively*, namely those who are considered to have competence in relation to the parties in the network of actors who formulate poverty policies in Makassar City. Determination of informants like this is based on judgments from experts (or researchers themselves) for certain purposes or certain situations (Neuman, 2014 ). The informants in this study were elements involved in the implementation of poverty reduction policies such as the Mayor of Makassar , Makassar City TKPKD Team , Government Elements starting from the Regency, District and Village levels, Makassar City BAZNAS , Business actors, Banking and SMEs in Makassar City , Poverty Reduction Program Assistant , Non-Governmental Organizations (NGOs) , as well as several community leaders . The data collection technique used is through observation ( observation ) , interviews ( *deep interview* ), and documentation. The data is processed through data reduction, then the results will be analyzed using a case study analysis strategy (Yin, 2000). The data analysis technique in this study uses the Miles and Huberman model which suggests that activities in qualitative data analysis are carried out interactively and take place continuously and to completion, so that the data is saturated. Activities in data analysis, namely *data reduction*, *data display*, and *conclusion drawing/verification* (Sugiyono, 2011).

## **RESULT AND DISCUSSION**

### **Implementation of Participatory Governance-Based Poverty Reduction Policy in Makassar City**

#### *Deliberative*

The substance of this dimension is related to the position of the decision or policy taken. Has it been discussed through deliberation to get a collective decision or policy, and how the actors and stakeholders involved have adapted to each other in the discussion or deliberation. The relationship with poverty reduction policies in Makassar City which is seen from the deliberative dimension, namely seeing poverty reduction policy decisions that are born jointly by stakeholders or stakeholders including in formulating, resolving and determining poverty problems or in producing poverty solutions.

The results showed that the liberative dimension of the poverty reduction policy implementation model in Makassar City, which was seen from: 1) The decision identification process that was born, showed that there were no poverty reduction decisions or policies that were born from the Makassar City Regional Poverty Reduction Coordination Team (TKPKD) forum. ; 2) The deliberation process carried out in this case the coordination process involves stakeholders or other interested actors even though it is only limited to coordination facilitated by Bappeda. Constraints in this deliberative process in poverty alleviation so that it has not given maximum results because several agencies or Regional Apparatus Organizations (OPD) included in the Decree (SK) regarding the Regional Poverty Reduction Coordination Team (TKPKD) do not know about the existence of the forum, including in conduct meetings or coordination meetings related to poverty alleviation.

#### *Action*

This dimension emphasizes how actions are taken in following up on collective decisions that have been agreed upon by deliberation. Has it been implemented through concrete actions. For the context of poverty reduction policies in Makassar City, seen from the action dimension, namely the process of implementing decisions or policies that are produced collectively (collectively) or related to the process of carrying out solutions that are born.

From the data collected, it shows that the action dimension in the implementation model of poverty reduction policies in Makassar City whose activities are carried out by the Regional Poverty Reduction Coordination Team (TKPKD), namely coordination

meetings to evaluate poverty programs carried out by each Regional Apparatus Organization (OPD). led by the Head of the TKPKD Team, in this case the Deputy Regent of Makassar City. Then, other activities at the TKPKD forum are still in the early stages, namely planning to carry out a Mapping Program for poverty reduction which is facilitated by the technical team of the TKPKD secretariat in Bappeda, meaning that TKPKD does not yet have a special program that must be run or coordinated. Constraints or problems faced by OPD in carrying out this poverty program are obstacles related to data collection that is not yet good so that the poverty program that is run is not optimal. In addition, there are also aspects of funding or budgeting that become an obstacle in carrying out poverty programs, so this requires other alternative budget sources.

### *Monitoring*

Monitoring is an important component of a powerful participatory governance model because it provides information about how well the experiment is working, where implementation requires more than turning an initial decision into an action; This dimension demands a continuous monitoring and accountability mechanism regarding the extent to which these deliberation groups are able to monitor the implementation of their decisions. The poverty policy implementation model implemented in Makassar City sees the monitoring dimension as an activity to monitor progress on the implementation of poverty reduction programs, namely joint monitoring where the TKPKD secretariat acts as a facilitator in carrying out the monitoring process.

Based on the results of observations, it can be seen that the monitoring activities on the implementation model of poverty reduction policies in Makassar City indicate that there is no monitoring activity for the implementation of poverty reduction programs carried out or born by the Regional Poverty Reduction Coordination Team (TKPKD). In general, poverty program activities in Makassar City are outside of this TKPKD, where the monitoring process is carried out by each Regional Apparatus Organization (OPD). Then, related to OPD which has a poverty program, carry out a monitoring process in the form of field visits and conduct evaluation meetings. This shows the dimension of monitoring that should be carried out together in monitoring the progress of poverty reduction programs is not being implemented.

### *Centralized Coordination and Power*

Empowered participatory governance model, local units do not act autonomously. Instead, they learn from and coordinate their actions with other local units and with state structures. The main question for this dimension is: "to what extent does this experiment incorporate recombinant actions that coordinate the actions of local units, disseminate information and innovation among them, and follow a centralized mechanism that ensures accountability and learning. The relationship with the model of implementation of poverty reduction policies in Makassar City on the dimension centralized coordination and power, this coordination is seen based on activities in coordinating poverty programs together involving all stakeholder actors facilitated by the TKPKD secretariat in carrying out the poverty reduction program.

Coordination activity (Centralized Coordination and Power) in the model of implementing poverty reduction policies in Makassar City shows coordination activities in meetings or meetings that have been carried out in the Regional Poverty Reduction Coordination Team (TKPKD) led by the Deputy Regent (TKPKD Team Leader) facilitated by Bappeda , it means that in this TKPKD forum, Bappeda becomes the leading sector in carrying out or coordinating the process in the form of meetings or meetings. The general condition for coordinating activities in carrying out poverty programs is that coordination is carried out by each Regional Apparatus Organization (OPD), sharing problems and poverty data in carrying out poverty programs. Coordination between DPOs is carried out in formal and informal forms. However, this activity also involves Bappeda as the leading sector coordination and coordination facilitator. So that this condition shows the dimensions of coordination that have not been carried out properly through the TKPKD forum.

### *School of Democracy*

This dimension emphasizes how the policy process is able to increase the capacity of individuals or groups involved in deliberation, so that it functions as a medium for learning democracy. In the poverty policy implementation model implemented in Makassar City, the dimension of *school of democracy* as a guarantee is carried out to maintain the democratic process carried out in the Regional Poverty Reduction Coordination Team (TKPKD) forum, meaning that this dimension sees that the democratic process (deliberation process) can be implemented properly. , so that the TKPKD Secretariat in carrying out the deliberation process must be able to gather



or involve all stakeholders in formulating and implementing poverty reduction programs.

model for implementing poverty reduction policies in Makassar City, which is seen in the *school of democracy dimension*, shows that the deliberation process (coordination meeting process) in the Regional Poverty Reduction Coordination Team (TKPKD) has not been carried out optimally because it has not produced decisions or policies related to poverty reduction in Makassar City. . Then, the coordination activities carried out by the TKPKD team for now only serve as a forum to discuss poverty program activities carried out by each OPD, so that the communication or interaction process is carried out by each OPD running the poverty program. In general, poverty reduction is carried out through a process of coordination, communication and implementation of poverty programs that are initiated or implemented by the relevant OPDs, including also in formulating poverty programs carried out by each OPD, so that the outputs of the poverty program have not shown the maximum results that are used as the basis for poverty reduction. as a medium for learning democracy in this model of implementation of participatory governance-based poverty reduction.

### *Outcomes*

This dimension relates to how the deliberation carried out resulted in a strategy or effect that was more desirable than the previous responsible institution? One of the main justifications for allocating public power to these decentralized and deliberation groups is that they devise public action strategies and solutions that are superior to command and control bureaucracies, based on superior knowledge of local conditions, greater learning capacity, and increased accountability. An important question from this dimension is whether these experiments have succeeded in producing more innovative solutions in practice. The implementation model of poverty reduction policies in Makassar City on the outcomes dimension is seen from the activities of the Regional Poverty Reduction Coordination Team (TKPKD), namely ensuring effective strategies for poverty reduction, including producing effective solution outcomes. So that these output activities can provide the results of a strategy or program that is implemented together.

The data above shows that the process of implementing the poverty reduction policy implementation model in Makassar City which is seen in the *outcomes*

*dimension* is the poverty reduction process carried out by the Regional Poverty Reduction Coordination Team (TKPKD) which shows that there is no output, both in terms of results and benefits generated, because there is no special programs that were born or formulated through the TKPKD forum. However, overall in activities within the TKPKD, interested stakeholders or actors already have a common awareness regarding synchronization and improvement of data on poverty. So that this data can be used as a guideline or reference later in formulating or intervening in poverty alleviation in Makassar City. In general, poverty reduction activities have not shown outcomes in TKPKD, so that outcomes can only be seen from the relevant OPD in carrying out poverty programs. Repair and synchronization of data is still based on the responsibility of each OPD. However, this improvement in data and data synchronization has received collective attention from the relevant OPD, that these improvements need to be worked on together.

## **CONCLUSION**

In practice, this model of implementing participatory governance-based poverty reduction policies shows conditions in TKPKD activities that are considered not optimal in coordinating or producing decisions or policies related to poverty reduction in Makassar City. 1) The deliberative dimension shows the process of identifying decisions that have been made, indicating that there are no poverty reduction decisions or policies that have been issued from the Makassar City Regional Poverty Reduction Coordination Team (TKPKD) ; 2) The action dimension shows the activities of coordinating meetings to evaluate poverty programs carried out by each Regional Apparatus Organization (OPD) led by the Head of the TKPKD Team, in this case the Deputy Regent of Makassar City ; 3) The monitoring dimension shows that there are no activities to monitor the implementation of poverty reduction programs carried out by the Regional Poverty Reduction Coordination Team (TKPKD); 4) The dimension of *centralized coordination and power* shows that coordination activities in meetings or meetings have been carried out in the Regional Poverty Reduction Coordination Team (TKPKD) led by the Deputy Regent (TKPKD Team Leader) facilitated by Bappeda, meaning that in this TKPKD forum Bappeda becomes the leading sector in implementing or carry out the coordination process in the form of meetings or meetings; 5) The school of democracy dimension shows that the deliberation process (coordination meeting process) in the Regional Poverty Reduction Coordination Team

(TKPKD) has not been carried out optimally because it has not produced decisions or policies related to poverty reduction in Makassar City ; and 6) Dimensions of outcomes show The poverty reduction process carried out by the Regional Poverty Reduction Coordination Team (TKPKD) shows that there is no output, both in terms of results and benefits. However, overall in activities within the TKPKD, interested stakeholders or actors already have a common awareness regarding synchronization and improvement of data on poverty.

## REFERENCES

- Alwi, 2018 . *Collaboration and policy performance (Challenges and strategies in policy determination and implementation)* : Jenny's bookstore. Yogyakarta.
- Albrow, Martin, 1989. *Bureaucracy* translated by Rusli Karim. Yogyakarta: PT. Tiara Wacana.
- Chhotray, V. & Stoker, G. 2009. *Governance Theory and Practice: A CrossDisciplinary Approach*, Palgrave Macmillan, Hampshire and New York.
- Cornwall, A. 2004. *Spaces for Transformation? Reflections on issues of Power and Difference in Participation in this Development*. London: Zed Books.
- Cristie, Ford. 2010. *New Governance in the Teeth of Human Frailty: Lessons From Financial Regulation*. WIS. L. REV. 441.
- DeLeon, P. and deLeon, L. 2002. 'What ever happened to policy implementation? An alternative approach', *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*. Vol. 12(4)
- Denhardt, RB 1995. *Public Administration an Action Orientation* . Harcourt Brace and Company.
- Drzek, John S., and Douglas Torgerson. 1993 "Democracy and the Policy Sciences." *Policy Sciences* 26:32:127-38.
- Fischer, F. 2006. 'Participatory Governance as Deliberative Empowerment: The Cultural Politics of Discursive Space'. *American Review of Public Administration*.
- Fung, A. And Wright, EO 2003 . *Deepening Democracy: Innovation in Empowered Participatory Governance*. *Politics and Society*, Vol. 29 (1).
- Gaventa, J. 2002. *Introduction: Exploring Citizenship, Participation and Accountability*. *IDS Bulletin*. Vol. 33 (2).
- Goodsell, CT 2006. "*A New Vision Public Administration*" , in *Public Administration Review*, Jul/August, 66, 4, Academic Research Library.
- Heller, P. 2001. *Moving the State; The Politics of Democratic Decentralization in Kerala, South Africa and Porto Alegre*. *Politics and Society*, Vol. 29 (1).
- Klijin, EH & Koppenjan, 2000. *Public management and policy networks: foundations of a network approach to governance*. *Public Management*.

- Mansbridge, Jane. 1980. *Beyond Adversary Democracy*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.
- Mitlin. D, 2004. Reshaping Local Democracy. *Environment and Urbanization* , vol. 16(1).
- Neuman, W. (2014). *Social Research Methods: Qualitative and Quantitative Approaches Seventh Edition*. Assex: Pearson Education Limited.
- Nye, Joseph S. Jr.; Zelikow, Philip D.; and King, David C, eds. 1997 *Why Americans Don't Trust Government*. Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Pres
- Yanow, Dvora. 1996. *How Does a Policy Mean?* Washington DC: Georgetown University Press.
- Makassar City Regional Development Profile 2020. Regional Development Planning Agency. Makassar city
- Salamon, LM, & Elliott, OV (2002). *The tools of government: A guide to the new governance* . Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Sugiyono. 2011. *Administrative Research Methods*. Bandung. CV. Alfabeta.
- Yol anda Y. Campbell. 2011. *New Governance in Action: Community Health Centers and the Public Health Service Act, 4 ST. Louis UJ Health L. & Pol'Y 397.*