

ESCALATING PEOPLE'S PARTICIPATION IN RURAL DEVELOPMENT THROUGH GO-NGO COLLABORATION

Meningkatkan Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pembangunan Desa Melalui Kerjasama OP-ONP

Gelar Satya Budhi

*Indonesian Centre for Agricultural Socio Economic and Policy Studies
Jl. A. Yani 70, Bogor 16161*

ABSTRAK

Pemerintah makin menyadari bahwa dengan pendekatan melibatkan masyarakat keberhasilan dalam melaksanakan pembangunan akan lebih mudah dicapai. Hal ini ditunjukkan dengan banyaknya proyek pemerintah yang dilaksanakan secara partisipatif. Kendati demikian, konsep partisipatif belum diadaptasi secara menyeluruh, di mana masyarakat tidak dilibatkan dalam semua tahap, terutama dalam perencanaan dan evaluasi. Hal ini mengakibatkan pelaksanaan proyek-proyek tersebut belum memberikan hasil seperti yang diharapkan. Dalam rangka meningkatkan partisipasi dan pemberdayaan masyarakat, pelaksanaan program bersama-sama antar Organisasi Pemerintah (OP) dengan Organisasi Non Pemerintah (ONP) dipandang prospektif. Dengan masing-masing kelebihanannya, perpaduan antara OP dan ONP dipandang akan lebih mampu meningkatkan partisipasi masyarakat terhadap program pembangunan yang dilaksanakan.

Kata kunci : *partisipasi, kerjasama OP- ONP, pembangunan pedesaan, pemberdayaan*

ABSTRACT

There is a growing concern on government perception that involving people in development is regarded important to deliver the success. This can be identified from participative programs and projects carried out, so far, by the government. In spite of the trend, such participation concept has not been implemented entirely, whereby people are not involved at all stages, especially in planning and evaluation. This condition causing the on going programs and projects unable to produce expected results. In terms of escalating people's participation and community empowerment, collaboration programs and projects between Government Organizations (GOs) and Non Government Organizations (NGOs) are deemed important to develop. This is particularly because each of these organization has its expertise on different fields which well understood to produce fruitful results if such capabilities are integrated.

Key words : *participation, GO-NGO collaboration, rural development, empowerment*

INTRODUCTION

Theoretical as well as empirical studies have clearly shown that success of rural development largely depends on the active involvement and participation of the beneficiaries rather than on the availability of technology, inputs, credit, etc (Patil, 1985). This development approach has being implemented by Non Government Organizations (NGOs) and introduced to government for years. Initially, the government which saw directive or top-down as the only best approach regarded that the approach suggested was not an appropriate choice. Rather, the government observed that the

approach has a lot of risks that will obscure the development itself. The government with its top-down approach believes that the wisdom of the experts as the main source of knowledge and the assumption that farmers and other beneficiaries in a population-at-large could not contribute to technical or production problems (Cummings, 1997).

It is believed that since 1980s, the government of Indonesia has started to utilize the experience of NGOs by making collaborations with the organizations on some activities. Such actions were actually triggered by the idea of a foreign funding agency which was willing that government included NGOs in national development, and worked hand-in-hand with the organizations. This course has

led the government to accept the notion that involving people in development is important, as people's participation in development is crucial for the success of any development program (Sharma, 1985). For that reason, the government has started to support the development approach in its development program by implementing some more people-oriented projects especially those related to poverty alleviation as well as rural development. The government even carried out some large-scale projects using the said suggested principle, with the hope that such efforts would immediately combat poverty among people across the country. However, this spirit of implementing the model of development tends to run under the favor of the government's way, which is actually ignored some crucial principles of people empowerment itself.

In spite of those facts, the government's respect over the abovementioned approach has been a good opportunity to put people-oriented development on the track, especially on rural development. This is also a sign that the government is aware of supporting the same carried out by NGOs. It is believed that improper implementation by government was due to poor experience in implementing the development model, as the government used to be stuck on directive approach that has been the only model used for decades. Therefore, it is necessary to support the government's recognition of the approach in spite of some weaknesses. Inappropriate implementation of the approach may not produce good result, but it can be an initial effort for better outcome. It is required to be noted that the process of raising people participation will take much time and fund, for which the government was currently not prepared. On the other hand, NGOs can only work partially or on only small-scale area because of limitation encountered. Therefore, some improvements that are integrating activities between the government and NGOs will improve the performance of the effort.

Objective of the article is to reaffirm the notion behind the participation, and the discussion on the pattern of government's project implementation and the potential collaboration with NGOs in implementing people empowerment projects, as part of rural development. It is believed that the performance of

people's participation and empowerment, related to rural development carried out by collaboration work, between government and NGOs, will give better results.

NOTIONS EMBEDDED IN THE PARTICIPATION CONCEPT

The word "participation" appeared for the first time in development jargon in the 1950s. In the 1970s the term was used in development literature and it even became a practice (Cummings, 1997). The term has been used to refer to citizen participation, community participation, public participation, popular participation and people participation, involving renewal or rehabilitation (Soen, 1981). It has also been used in studies on conservation (Curtis and Lockwood, 2000; Townshend and Pendlebury, 1999); village regrouping (Olujimi and Egunjobi, 1991); water supply (Fitzgerald, 1993; Bah, 1992); community centre development (Setterlund and Abbott, 1995); housing (Fahui and Van Loo, 1998; Nientied et al., 1990; Stein, 1990); social impact (Durst, 1994); health promotion (Goddman and Speers, 1998); community planning (Berkeley *et al.*, 1995); and also on management of environmental and health risks (Rowe and Frewer, 2000).

The aforementioned use of participation term shows that participation that is employed for different context will convey various meaning to adjust with the objective of the activities. Obviously, the use of practical definition is deemed useful, as each activity in each location with different culture may have dissimilar value about the level of people capability or other condition, by which people's participation is determined. This situation may appear from the problem of encouraging people to identify what they need to improve their lives. For that reason, community developers do not use minimal indicators of participation, in which such indicators identify only the people's participation on whatever the people give to the programs that are carried out. Otherwise, participation on planning as the most important indicator is ignored.

In spite of those facts, the principle of participation should not run away from the spirit of forging people in rural development.

This suggests that participation should relate to at least three concepts, namely initiative, empowerment, and organization. The three elements are, in fact, the prerequisite that participation is available and ready to sustain. For example, when rural residents have their own initiatives and capabilities which are organized, they are theoretically ready to participate in rural development. The explanation of the three concepts is discussed in the following.

Initiative

Initiative is the most important factor in rural development, as it reflects the willingness of people in rural development. When the people participate in a project, their initiative should appear on planning from which their needs will be catered. The initiative of changing people's lives can come from within of the people or from external agents which inculcate initiatives among people. Indigenous initiatives can become a so-called spontaneous participation which reflects a voluntary and autonomous action on the part of the people to organize and deal with their problems unaided by government or other external agents (Midgley, 1986).

The emergence of indigenous initiatives can come from a mounting need of people caused by pressure of varied needs and problems whereby people are encouraged to change their lives. Oakley and Marsden (1984) showed that the *Bhoomi Sena* (Land Army) movement in India is an example of indigenous initiative. The *Bhoomi Sena* movement was forging a bond between the *adivasis* (tribals) and other poor groups in the region into a united force. This spontaneous participation was an ideal model of participation (Midgley, 1986) since it was very difficult to find it in real world. Often, however, external aid is needed in emerging their initiatives.

In fact, in most cases, people's initiatives emerge through inducement by external agents. This is because people under oppression cannot identify their own problems. In his research in Sulawesi, Indonesia, for example, Cumming (1997) found that in most situations, local villagers or agencies are poorly equipped to make initiatives for a project or program. Some outside stimulus (a

new program, an idea by an outsider, a project carried out somewhere else) would provide the initiative for a project or program. In the case of a project in Sulawesi, the initiative for a regional development project came from national awareness of the need to deal with the different contexts and realities of the diverse regions of Indonesia.

Emergence of people's initiative is very important in people empowerment as well as rural development in order that people can decide to the maximum possible extent on matters affecting themselves (Okafor, 1982). Oakley and Marsden (1984) showed that external agents could encourage people's initiatives to appear as a strong motivation to empower themselves for a better life. In their book they described that through encouraging people's initiatives, poor fisherwomen who earned their living from fishing in swamps in rural Brazil, could organize themselves to improve their lives. The work of animator, who came into the fisherwomen's lives and encouraged them intensively, was proven effective.

Empowerment

According to Cohen (1996), participation as an empowerment of the community is similar to power ownership by the community. In a people-centered development approach, for example, the relationship between participation and power is widely recognized. Participation also has an educational effect on citizens, alerting them to their civic duties and helping them to recognize the common good (White, 1997). On further objective, the aim of participation is to achieve human potentials whereby people become subjects in their own world rather than objects in some other people's world (Oakley and Marsden in Wright, 1986).

White (1981) mentioned five reasons whereby participation is related to empowering people, namely: a) participation has an intrinsic value for participants; b) participation encourages a sense of responsibility; c) participation uses valuable indigenous knowledge; d) participation frees people from dependence on others' skills; e) participation makes people more conscious of the causes of their poverty and what they can do about it. This means that

capacity building and participation affect each other, in which better capacity will encourage participation and participation will improve people's capacity.

Likewise, Finsterbusch and van Wicklin III (1987) saw that there were three main reasons why people must participate in development. *Firstly*, public participation will mobilize greater resources and accomplish more with the same project budget. It is also economically efficient in that it uses local labor and, while at the same time it develops indigenous knowledge. *Secondly*, participation promotes better project design. Through participation, felt needs are served. Beneficiaries are given the chance to shape a project to their specific needs. As a consequence, a sense of responsibility and ownership will be developed among people. *Lastly*, there are spin-off arguments that participation can become a catalyst for mobilizing further local development efforts.

Indonesia has the opportunity to empower themselves especially in making plan and delivering services. This is triggered by the move of the country from a centralized to a decentralized planning model (Beard, 2005). The two key pieces of legislation underlying this shift are Law No. 22 and Law No. 25, passed in 1999 and implemented in 2001. The enactment of these laws has changed Indonesia from a highly centralized state, with governance, planning, and fiscal management partially 'deconcentrated' to provincial government offices, to a decentralized state with power over these responsibilities 'devolved' to lower levels of government. This allows more people to participate in national development and in turn escalate their self empowerment.

Organization

Organization is considered very important in any projects and programs in which participation is to be the main focus. Participation in group activity has enhanced social cohesion, increases the capacity of rural communities to attract resources from governments, and enables them to respond to change (Alexander, 1995). Patil (1985) believes that participation cannot occur in an institutional vacuum, and a participation strategy without organizational basis is doubtful.

Organizational establishment is needed in project implementation to facilitate participants organizing themselves in order to maintain and make effective participation. Finsterbusch and van Wicklin III (1987) stated that even though beneficiaries can participate as individuals, it is frequently argued that the results are greater if their participation is through organizations. An organization itself has intrinsic psychological value for people who usually feel powerless to change their conditions, but who gain courage and strength through numbers (Finsterbusch and van Wicklin III, 1987).

Therefore, only if rural poor can be brought into some form of organization structure, would their participation be ensured (Oakley and Marsden, 1984). An organization is necessary to ensure that participation is fostered on a collective basis such that all members of the community have equal access to project benefits and decision-making rather than that local elites monopolize the benefits or authority, and thus reinforce local stratification and cleavages (Yusof *et al.*, 1989). The study of Curtis and Lockwood (2000) on landcare and catchment management in Australia showed that with effective local and regional organizations emerging, there is evidence that many perceived limitations of public participation can be overcome.

Oakley and Marsden (1984) suggested that introduction of organization from the outside should be avoided instead an authentic form of organization should be encouraged. In addition, Buller and Wright (1990) argued that appropriate organizational forms were needed if rural development were to occur. According to Finsterbusch and van Wicklin III (1987), there are numerous channels for organizing participation. There may be existing formal organizations such as village councils or marketing co-operatives. Examples of informal associations include kinship groups or community traditions of voluntary self-help. Furthermore, projects can also create new organizations for specific types of beneficiary participation, such as irrigation-user association.

Although organization is regarded as one of the most important prerequisites in rural development, Indonesia experiences unresolved difficulties in establishing it. Constructing organization as the vehicle for people's participation is one of the activities in every

project, which takes much time and funds. However, only a few organizations that could live for long enough time, while others terminated far earlier, and the rests were not even formed. In order to improve the existing organization development, there is a need to learn other elements of rural development. It is possible that with original initiatives and more empowered people, organization is more conducive to develop.

CHALLENGES TO GENUINE PARTICIPATION

Evidences show that in the projects carried out by government, participatory method is not comprehensively and properly applied. The project implemented takes the participation concept for granted without well understanding. The concept is even used only for labeling or to show that the former approach (instructive or directive or top-down approach) has been left. This is the answer why the echo of the participatory concept implementation is not able to generate people's participation, especially genuine participation in which people to get involved in planning, implementation, and evaluation.

Actually, the government has long story of supporting the emergence of 'participation'. During the long period of military rule, for example, participation was imposed by strong state on the local population. First President of Indonesia, Soekarno, tried to use the notions of mutual assistance and self-reliance to unify the diverse group in the new country and to provide a form of cultural legitimacy to state control (Mansuri and Rao, 2004). The state had to be strongly authoritarian and development had to proceed in a cooperative and collaborative manner. In spite of the efforts, such action did not support the principle of encouraging genuine people's participation.

Further description of difficulties of encouraging original participation, Sullivan in Mansuri and Rao (2004) noted that in his detailed ethnography of local development in a Javanese community, demonstrates that the combination of an autocratic state and the principles of mutual assistance and self-reliance resulted in a form of forced labor:

Being a good Indonesian meant contributing labor and cash for development projects. Collective action was the norm. Grants received by the village headman assumed, in the mismatch between the size of the funds and expected cost of the project, that most funds would be locally mobilized. Contributions from the community were mobilized by the ward leaders. Everyone was expected to contribute free labor – or face social, political, material, and even physical sanctions. There was no choice but to participate.

In relation to genuine participation, from his research in some countries, Midgley (1986) concluded that it would be wrong to claim that the government's response to community participation has been unequivocally supportive and that it may be categorized as constituting a true participatory model. Midgley added that government responses to community participation ideas in urban development have often been haphazard and poorly formulated, and there are substantial variations in the extent to which these ideas have been applied in different countries.

However, while many argue that people's participation is crucial in any development, some are doubtful whether participation can happen voluntarily. The degree of voluntary participation will determine whether people are confined to participation on shallow or deep context (Skolimowski, 2002). Development specialists also argue that participation has to be forced on people, especially by outside forces. Any intervention from outsiders to 'push' participation is however debatable. Midgley (1986), for example, highlighted the inconsistencies of the community participation theory which insists on people's autonomous and spontaneous participation, while at the same time advocating an important role for change agents. Uphoff in Curtis and Lockwood (2000) referred to this as the paradox of participation, where "top-down" efforts were required to promote "bottom-up" development. This happens as people living in economically depressed regions could not even identify their own problems (Cummings, 1997) nor improve their conditions. In relation to this, Midgley (1986) reminds us that "there is little evidence to show that state support and community initiatives have been effectively combined to promote authentic participation".

Much literature shows that a lot of projects failed to get participation from targeted people with various types and degrees. Oakley and Marsden (1984) reviewed the obstacles from various projects in several countries. The identification of obstacles was referred to as “means” and “end” dichotomy. Participation as a means suggests a set of obstacles usually associated with the operational procedures of the tasks being undertaken. On the other hand, participation as an end suggests obstacles which are more associated with structural and institutional relationships both at the national and local levels. According to Oakley and Marsden (1984) the major areas of obstacles are as follows:

- (a) Operational. In view of the dominance of understanding participation as a mean and of its relationship with development programs, obstacles are identified in terms of the operational mechanism of the development program. It includes over-centralized planning, inadequate delivery mechanisms, lack of local co-ordination, inappropriateness of project technology, irrelevant project content, and lack of local structures.
- (b) Cultural. The cultural factors that impede participation are resistance to change, marginalization, dependence, oppression, and culture of silence to voicing out for participation in development. Other obstacles also include the inherent weakness of most rural people - their fears of opposition, and their weariness to outside cajoling to get involved.
- (c) Structural. Structural obstacle is a system that makes unequal access to- and control over-societal wealth and power. It is argued that the persistence in “anti-participatory” structures has caused the failure of many local level initiatives to promote participation. The structure spreads out to regional and local levels and pervades all forms of formal and informal institutions and relationships.

Obstacles to community participation are identified in the attitudes and practices of the personnel in development agencies and national/local government administrations, in the service providers and field staff's attitudes

and in the community itself (Cohen, 1996). A study carried out by Cotton and Skinner (1990) on resident participation in slum improvement showed that appropriate technology was needed to raise resident participation. Cotton and Skinner (1990) listed technologies of infrastructure maintenance that are suitable or unsuitable for residents, which can guide implementers to raise resident participation.

From his research in a pump irrigation project in Indramayu Regency, Budhi (2007) found that although farmers could finally reap success in the Farmers' Water User Association (*Perhimpunan Petani Pemakai Air/P3A*) pump irrigation project and even though it is still operational up until now, it does not show that the project would continue to run smoothly and the farmers would fully participate in the project. Rather, to some extent, farmers were obstructed or discouraged to participate in the project both in the planning and its implementation. For example, in the planning stage some farmers stopped attending meetings, which impeded the project implementation process. In the implementation stage, before the project hand-over, the farmers could not maintain their work without any problems. Likewise, related activities were suspended many times for longer durations. They needed more time to finish the irrigation construction. After project hand-over, most farmers could not be encouraged to maintain their commitments by paying irrigation service fees fully.

Budhi (2007) also identified that there are some obstacles coming from various sources that obstructed or discouraged the farmers in participating in the project. Three sources of obstacles are those related to farmers themselves, poor encouragement from local leaders and the agency that implemented the project. Substantial obstacles that affected farmers as project recipients were: time constraints, dependency attitudes, needless interference from rich farmers and lack of concentration to paddy farming due to other jobs. The weaknesses of the executing committee could be addressed to the poor performance of the steering committee, lack of field worker who should act as community organizers and the internal weakness of the P3A management.

POTENTIAL OF GO-NGO COLLABORATION

Government Organizations (GOs)-NGO collaboration can be described as a relationship rooted in the acceptance of both parties of their shared vision and responsibility for the delivery of social services within policy and legislative frameworks governing a country's response to its social needs and problems. It is an acknowledgement, acceptance and respect by each party of the other's distinct, but mutually complementary and interdependent roles for the attainment of shared goals.

Partnership embodies the notion of acceptance by both parties that their respective roles are of equal importance in the pursuit of their shared vision and goals, specifically as they relate to social justice and equality. Partnership demands both close co-ordination between the parties and the co-ordination of roles and functions throughout the entire process of policy development to service delivery. A partnership accepts that there is strength in unity and that the total is greater than the sum of the individual parts.

General Pattern of GO-NGO Collaboration

Partnership between Government Organizations (GOs) and NGOs is an important phenomenon in current development. This partnership is considered valuable since GOs and NGOs can complement each other. The government which tends to employ top-down approach (Ismawan, 1999) often produces unsatisfactory results for people and cannot reach people on grassroots level. On the other hand, NGOs struggle to commit to use bottom-up approach in implementing their projects, although many of which are not perfect or even failed. It largely depends on the capability of the organization. This approach is used to promote self-reliance of people, especially those who have not been touched by the government's development programs.

The roles of NGOs in developing bottom-up approach and participatory method have been widely recognized. This has made up broad perceptions about NGOs, namely (Farrington, 1993): *first*, NGOs represent a force towards democratic and pluralist civil society; *second*, they have particular strengths

in poverty alleviation and sustainable development; and *third*, they offer the prospect of enhancing the efficiency of public sector service delivery. In fact, such perceptions are valuable to increase participation; therefore, partnership of GOs-NGOs is considered urgent to get strong support.

GOs-NGOs partnerships with some successes can be found in studies in seven countries, namely Bangladesh, India, Thailand, Nepal, Philippines, Indonesia, and Thailand (Farrington, 1993). GOs-NGOs partnerships can be found in varied activities, and each shares roles conforming to its capacity and capability (see Table 1). Farrington (1993) identifies three types of potential interactions from GOs-NGOs partnership. *First*, GOs adopt and 'scale-up' innovations developed by NGOs, whether in technologies, research methods or institutional arrangements. *Second*, GOs and NGOs work together, the strengths of one compensating for the weakness of the other in performing Agricultural Technology Development (ATD) functions. Specifically, GOs would conduct research; NGOs would field-test, disseminate and provide feedback necessary to influence subsequent research agenda. *Third*, over a longer period, NGOs would support the emergence of grassroots organizations capable of taking over many of their functions which can largely be explained in terms of comparative advantage and of the 'gain from trade' consequence that might be made.

Meera (1996) identified three types of GO-NGO collaboration. First is an arrangement where the NGOs help in introducing participatory approaches in projects. A second type of partnership is where the NGOs facilitate large government programs. The examples are the Community Mortgage program in Philippines, KIP in Surabaya, Indonesia and earthquake related program in India. The third types of partnerships are where considerable coverage has been achieved through alternative delivery system and frameworks. The main examples are the Grameen Bank of Bangladesh, Sulabh International in India and the recently formed Urban Community Development Office in Thailand. In all strong and committed leadership, composition of the governing board and a strong emphasis on rigorous internal management system has contributed to the success of these ventures.

Table 1. Respective GO and NGO Roles Identified from Case Studies in Bangladesh, India, Thailand, Nepal, Philippines, Indonesia, and Thailand

Role	Feature	Mode and level
GO - NGO Partnerships within the research-extension continuum.	NGOs obtain and test technology from GOs and provide feedback	<i>Collaborative</i> : each side relies on the other to contribute to agreed activities in accordance with perceived comparative advantages. In the absence of agreed inputs from one side or the other, the activity cannot fully succeed. Formal agreements usually are reached.
GO-NGO partnerships independent of the research-extension continuum.	In join GO-NGO projects, NGOs provide social organizational and delivery components; GOs provide technical inputs.	
NGOs innovate; GO response varies	NGOs innovate – whether in technical, procedural, institutional or methodological ways – in the expectation that GOs will ‘scale up’	<i>Incorporative</i> : GOs may disregard NGO innovations; if they do wish to adopt them, this may be through working together in the initial stages (i.e. as NGO teaches GO) before GO incorporates lessons from the NGO into its own actions.
NGOs as networkers among themselves and with GOs.	NGOs establish foray in which ideas are exchanged among themselves and/or between NGOs and GOs.	<i>Informative</i> : NGOs provide information on activities or on technologies to each other or to GOs sometimes leading to co-ordination among projects or activities.
NGOs advocate; GO response varies.	NGOs seek pro-poor administrative of legislative reform, or the full implementation of existing laws and procedures	<i>Conflictive</i> : NGOs seek to change GO practice through confrontation, lengthy negotiation or working from within

Source: Farrington *et al.* (1993)

Such success of collaboration can lead to quality partnership and better performance of both organizations, which in turn will benefit the beneficiaries. This condition allows local organizations to grow up through which people will participate. In fact, high people's participation in organizations enables an uphill social capital and escalates self-confidence to develop them.

GO-NGO Collaboration in Indonesia

In Indonesia, some partnership activities between GOs and NGOs have also been undertaken both with at central and local levels. The most prominent partnership between them can be identified from the work of Bina Swadaya and the Institute for Social and Economic Research, Education and Information (LP3ES), the biggest NGOs in

Indonesia. Funded by international funding agencies, such as USAID (United States Agency for International Development), Ford Foundation, as well as the government budget, GOs and NGOs shared roles in varied projects. Besides partnership with the two big NGOs, the government had also made partnership with many NGOs nationwide; for example, in Identification of Underdeveloped Region Program (IDT Program), Safety Net Program, and farm credit delivery.

The partnership activities carried out by the government and Bina Swadaya included the Transmigration Development Program, Nucleus-Plasma Plantation Corporation program, Social Forestry Program, and the Poverty Alleviation Program (Ismawan, 1999). In the Transmigration Development Program, Bina Swadaya supported the program through developing Self-Reliance

Group. In the program of Nucleus-Plasma Plantation Corporation, it played a role as a cohesive device and functioning as a motivator, facilitator, and catalyst of nucleus (Plantation Corporation) and plasma (plantation farmers). In the Social Forestry Program, it played a role in problem solution over conflict between inhabitants that live in and around forest and *Perum Perhutani* as the government corporation that manages the forest. Meanwhile, the role of Bina Swadaya in Poverty Alleviation Program was undertaking training to 2,000 new academician degree-holders who would be sent to poor villages.

Partnership activities between LP3ES and the government were mostly in irrigation projects (Atmanto *et al.*, 1997). The projects consisted of High Performance Traditional Irrigation System (HPSIS), 1982-1985; Tertiary Irrigation Development Project using farmers' participation system; Traditional Irrigation Development Project in Lahat South Sumatera, 1985-1990; Inter Water-Management-Area Coordination-Institution Development Project Batusangkar, West Sumatera, 1987-1991; Inter-Subak Coordination Institution Development Project in Subak Gede in Bali, 1985-1986; Study of Function Increase and P3A Role Policy, 1987-1995; Small-Scale Irrigation Hand-over Project, 1987-1991; Small-Scale Irrigation Management Project (SSIMP), 1990-1995; and PIK Program Process Documentation and Monitoring Project, 1991-1993.

More recent collaboration of government and non government organization at various degrees of each involvement can be found in some activities related to humanity aids. These include recovery of post-tsunami catastrophe that hit Aceh and Nias. Similar activities can also be found in some areas struck by earthquake, such as Aceh, Yogyakarta, Nias, and North Sumatera. Collaboration of GO-NGO also occurred in contending disease (Avian Influenza), polio vaccination, environmental preservation (flora and fauna), and so forth.

PIDRA (Participatory Integrated Development in Rainfed Area) is a fresh example of successful GO-NGO collaboration. PIDRA is a collaboration project between the government of Indonesia and IFAD (International Fund for

Agricultural Development) focusing on dryland and rainfed areas, which gets less opportunity in development process. The target of the project is the rural poor community, or the pauper who carries out traditional farming without sufficient facilities, and economically incapable. PIDRA project has four objective, namely (Proyek PIDRA Jawa timur, 2006): a) to increase farmers' income, b) to activate natural and environmental resource conservation and preservation, c) to set up sustainable agricultural system (farming group and women participation), and d) to materialize rural sustainable food security.

Another good example of fruitful collaboration of the two parties is the project of payment of environmental services (PES) in Cidanau Watershed. PES is a kind of compensation or payment for the producers or the sellers of environmental services which should be paid by the beneficiaries or the buyers. The producer or the sellers deserve to get the compensation or payment as they have made efforts to assure that the ecosystem is maintained for its sustainability. This project was carried out by national as well as local level NGO with some local government organizations. Different from other many collaboration projects, the main funding agency of PES project is a private water supply company. The company funded the project with respect to sustain water supply in Cidanau Watershed by encouraging the communities in downstream as well as upstream areas.

In transparent collaboration of the two parties, beneficiaries found themselves encouraged to speak up their problems and needs. This then lead to come up with initiatives to solve their problems and cater their needs. They were also motivated to keep their commitment to implement the planning. At this stage, facilitators from NGOs and officers from GOs gave them assistance to achieve their goal. The bottom-up approach and more effective roles of GO-NGO have apparently made the initiatives of farmers and other village residents came up. The initiatives were the most important capital for them, since it can potentially create high participation among the beneficiaries.

Challenges of GO-NGO Collaboration

Despite increasing number of GO-NGO collaborations, some obstacles that spoil the partnership keep appearing. Such impediments surface as the culture of both sides is different in nature. GOs bring the culture of bureaucrat which seems rigid as all works will rely on legal basis or rules, regulations, and law. It is difficult for a GO to run a collaboration activity in absence of rules or regulation or law that supports the activity. On the other hand, NGOs, which are embedded with freedom and open, are ready to make collaborations and actions with any organizations with more flexible manner.

GO-NGO collaboration, like the activities of NGOs, has evolved from limited interaction and discord to greater engagement and accommodation within the past decades. At the district, regional and national levels of governance, government officials and NGO leaders and activists started to interact, acknowledging the complementary nature of their separate but related roles. Through this interaction both actors have come to understand their separate concerns and anxieties, appreciate the importance of their separate roles, shared aspirations and commitment to poverty reduction, human development and good democratic governance in the country. Growing awareness of the need for GOs and NGOs to work together has not diminished the determination of each actor to protect and promote civil, political, economic, social and cultural rights, and perform duties fundamental to *“the establishment of a just and free society”* (NCG, 2000).

Learning from a case in Ghana, NCG (2000) noted that in order to realize the full potential of the evolving relations between the GOs and NGOs, a number of issues and controversies that have impeded relations in the past and present and could stall progress in the future should be addressed. Government concerns which potentially obstruct collaboration are related to the following points:

- (a) Some NGOs operate without proper registration, making it difficult to monitor their operations as non-profit organizations.

- (b) NGOs have the tendency of executing projects without prior consultations with district and regional development planning authorities. Apart from problems of duplication, these practices divert attention from official development priorities and makes for inefficient allocation and utilization of limited development resources.
- (c) Rivalry and competition among NGOs fuels the proliferation of NGOs and makes them ‘ungovernable’ and difficult to represent in high-level policy-making.
- (d) Allegations of fraudulent practices and violation of rules of non-profit operations questions the identity and credibility of some NGOs.
- (e) Poor discharge of the duty of NGOs in submitting reports of their operations to the appropriate authorities raise questions about their transparency and local accountability.
- (f) Lack of information happens over the scope of NGOs activities in the non-profit sector that would facilitate measurement of their contributions to economic growth and development.

On the other hand, NGOs see that some government policies do not give enough rooms to speed up its movement. The following are some concerns regarded to potentially undermine GO-NGO collaboration:

- (a) Government officials tend to make statements that question their *“status”* as autonomous civil society organizations, *“identity”* as credible actors in the non-profit sector, *“right”* to participate in the formulation of social and economic policies, not merely in the implementation of government programs, and to advocate change
- (b) Government takes more interest in regulating them in a manner that controls their operations and undermines their autonomy than promote their self-regulation and growth.
- (c) Lack of prior consultation with NGOs on the making of policies or decisions that affect their operations.

- (d) Government overlooks the problem of inadequate financial support for NGOs and the need to assist them to build their operational capacities and provide information to facilitate development planning.

CONCLUSION AND POLICY IMPLICATIONS

Success of rural development largely depends on the active involvement and participation of the beneficiaries. This principle has been adopted by government by implementing participatory method in some projects and programs carried out. However, the method implemented has not lifted people's participation significantly. This is due to participation concept has not been implemented entirely, whereby people are not involved at all stages, especially in planning and evaluation. This makes the programs and projects undertaken have not produced promising results

Participatory method appears to be the best method as it contains some embedded notions. There are at least three embedded notions in participation, namely encouraging beneficiaries to come up with their own initiatives, making participants empowered to carry out various related jobs, and encouraging them to work in organized manner. High people's participation can only appear if genuine participation is developing among the beneficiaries.

GO-NGO collaboration is considered valuable to raise people's participation, especially in rural development. This is because through collaboration, expertise of each institution can cover the weakness of each other. GO-NGO collaborations have been found in some projects and programs in varied fields, some of which have proved that the collaborations are fruitful, in terms of high participation.

There is a need that the government to improve the method of implementing participatory method, especially by involving people in all stages of development, from planning to evaluation. This includes implementation of developing genuine participation among the beneficiaries. Such action allows

the beneficiaries to find their own problems and discover the right way to overcome the problems.

It is necessary that further collaborations could be implemented extensively nationwide. For better results, it is required that such collaborations would not only come from outside funding agencies, but also from the government in order to find itself free of making any kinds of programs and projects in line with national priorities. This is also to exhibit that the performance of programs or projects implementation were not dependent on the initiative of external agencies. For that reason, there is a need to find ways of overcoming some obstacles hindering GO-NGO collaboration.

REFERENCE

- Alexander, H. 1995. A Framework for Change: The State of the Community Landcare Movement in Australia. The National Landcare Facilitator Project Annual Report. Canberra. National Landcare Program.
- Atmanto, S.D., Kuswanto, N. Hartono, S. Salim, M. Mahar, and Munawir. 1997. Membangun Irrigasi Bersama Petani: Pengalaman LP3ES. Jakarta: PSDAL-LP3ES.
- Badan Ketahanan Pangan. 2005. Program Pengembangan Lahan Kering Terpadu (PIDRA). Badan Ketahanan Pangan, Departemen Pertanian.
- Bah, O.M. 1992. Community Participation and Rural Water Supply Development in Siera Leone. *Community Development Journal*, Vol.27 No.1.
- Beard, V.A. 2005. Individual determinants of participation in community development in Indonesia. *Environment and Planning C: Government and Policy 2005*, volume 23, University of California, Irvine, Social Ecology I, Irvine, Received 1 July 2003; in revised form 15 September 2004
- Berkeley, N., G. Goodall, D. Noon, and C. Collis. 1995. Involving the Community in Plan Preparation. *Community Development Journal*, Vol.30 No.2.
- Budhi, G.S. 2007. Obstacles Related to Farmers' Participation in Pump Irrigation Project. *Jurnal Masyarakat dan Budaya* Vol.9 No.2. Lembaga Ilmu Pengetahuan Indonesia, Pusat Penelitian Kemasyarakatan dan Kebudayaan, Jakarta.

- Buller, H and S. Wright. 1990. Introduction: Concepts and Policies for Rural Development. In *Rural Development: Problems and Practices* (pp.1-24). Editors: H. Buller and S. Wright. Brookfield, VT.
- Cohen, S.I. 1996. Mobilizing Communities for Participation and Empowerment. In *Participatory Communication for Social Change* (pp.223-248). Jan Servaes; Thomas L Jacobson; Shirley. A White (eds). New Delhi: Sage Publications.
- Cotton, A and R. Skinner. 1990. Barriers to Resident Participation in Slum Improvement: The Maintenance Question. *Community Development Journal*, 25(1).
- Cummings, F.H. 1997. Role of Participation in the Evaluation and Implementation of Development Projects. *Knowledge and Policy*, Vol.10 No.1/2.
- Curtis, A and M. Lockwood.. 2000. Landcare and Catchment Management in Australia: Lesson for State-Sponsored Community Participation. *Society and Natural Resources*, Vol.13 No.1.
- Durst, D. 1994. "Heavy Sledding": Barriers to Community Participation in Beaufort Sea Hydrocarbon Development. *Community Development Journal*, Vol.29 No.1.
- Fahui, W and J.A van Loo. 1998. Citizen Participation in the North Delta Mississippi Community Development Block Grants, Empowerment Zones and Enterprise Communities. *Planning Practice & Research*, Vol.13 No.4.
- Farrington, J., D. Lewis, S. Satish, and A. Mclatvees (eds). 1993. *Non-Governmental Organizations and the State in Asia: Rethinking roles in Sustainable Agricultural Development*. London and New York: Routledge.
- Finsterbusch, K and W.A. van Wicklin III,. 1987. The Contribution Beneficiary Participation to Development Project Effectiveness. *Public Administration and Development*, Vol. 7.
- Fitzgerald, M. 1993. Participatory Community Development in Bophuthatswana. *Community Development Journal*, No.28 No.1.
- Goddman, R.M. and M.A. Speers. 1998. Identifying and Defining the Dimensions of Community Capacity to Provide a Basis for Measurement. *Health Education & Behaviour*, Vol.25 No.3.
- Ismawan, B. 1999. *Refleksi Seorang Pegiat LSM: Pemberdayaan Orang Miskin*. Jakarta: Puspawara.
- Mansuri, G and V. Rao. 2004. Community-Based and -Driven Development: A Critical Review. *The World Bank Research Observer*, Vol. 19, No.1. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development/ The World Bank.
- Meera, M. 1996. New Trends for the Government - NGO Partnerships in Asia. GONGO Project, Habitat International Coalition, Mexico. Case study, <http://www.hic-net.org/document.asp?PID=16>. June 29, 2008.
- Midgley, J. 1986. Community Participation: History, Concepts and Controversies. In *Community Participation, Social Development and the State* (pp.13-44). James Midgley (ed). London: Methuen.
- National Consultative Group (NCG). 2000. Draft National Policy for Strategic Partnership with NGOs. NGO/GOG Joint National Conference, Elmina Beach Resort 24-27 October 2000.
- Nientied, P., S.B. Mhenni, and J. de Wit. 1990. Community Participation in Low-Income Housing Policies: Potential Paradox. *Community Development Journal*, Vol.25 No.1.
- Oakley, P and D. Marsden. 1984. *Approach to Participation in Rural Development*. Geneva: Published on Behalf of the Ace Task Force on Rural Development (by the International Labour Office).
- Okafor, F.C. 1982. Community Involvement in Rural Development: A Field Study in the Bendel State of Negeria. *Community Development Journal*, Vol.17 no.2.
- Olujimi, B and L. Egonjubi. 1991. Public Participation in a Village Regrouping Scheme. *Community Development Journal*, Vol. 26 No.1
- Patil, R.K. 1985. Role of Development Communication in Active Participation of the Poor in Rural Development Programmes in India. In *Development Communication and Grassroots Participation* (pp.23-42). Minoru Ouchi and M.J Campbell (eds). Association of Development Research and Training Institute of Asia and the Pacific (ADIPA).
- Proyek PIDRA Jawa Timur. 2006. Laporan Program PIDRA Tahap-1 (2001-2004) dan Tahap-2 (2005-2008). Proyek Pengembangan Lahan Kering Terpadu (PIDRA) Provinsi Jawa Timur. Surabaya.

- Rowe, G and L.J. Frewer. 2000. Public Participation Methods: A Framework for Evaluation. *Science, Technology and Human Values*, Vol.25 No.1.
- Setterlund, D and J. Abbott. 1995. Older Woman Participating in the Community Pathways and Barriers. *Community Development Journal*, Vol.30 No.3.
- Sharma, S.L. 1985. Communication, Stratification and Development Participation in India in *Development Communication and Grass-root Participation* edited by Minori Ouchi, M.J. Campbell. Association of Development Research and Training Institutes of Asia and the Pacific (ADIPA).
- Skolimowski, H. 2002. Politics in a New Participatory Perspective. The Eco-Philosophy Center. <http://www.ecophilosophy.org/articles/cosmicnews/sep.html>. June 30, 2008.
- Soen, D. 1981. Citizen and Community Participation Urban Renewal and Rehabilitation – Comments on Theory and Practice. *Community Development Journal*, Vol.16 No.2.
- Stein, A. 1990. Critical Issue in Community Participation in Self-help Housing Programs. The Experience of FUNDASAL. *Community Development Journal*, Vol.25 No.1.
- Townshend, T and J. Pendlebury. 1999. Public Participation in the Conservation of Historic Areas: Case Studies from North-East England. *Journal of Urban Design*, 4(3).
- White, A. 1981. *Community Participation in Water and Sanitation: Concepts, Strategies and Methods*. International Reference Centre for Community Water Supply and Sanitation. Technical Paper No. 17, June, 1981. The Netherlands: HM Rijswijk.
- White, C.S. 1997. Citizen Participation and the Internet: Prospect for Civic Deliberation in the Information Age. *Social Studies*, Vol.88 No.1.
- Wright, S. 1990. Development Theory and Community Development Practice. In *Rural Development: Problems and Practices* (pp. 41-64). Henry Buller and Susan Wright (eds). Aldershot, Brookfield: Avebury.
- Yusof, K., S. Batumalai, W.Y. Lin, and J. Okamura. 1989. *The ABCs of Community Participation in Primary Health Care. A Manual*. Kuala Lumpur: Department of Publications, University of Malaya.