Village development program: The view of "askesiros" in social construction, a development reality of Local Papuan Residents in Manokwari Regency
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Abstract. This research purpose was to explore the knowledge and experience of local Papuan towards the village programs. Data was collected from three villages. This research gained the data by using the questionnaires, the focused group discussions (FGD), the observations, and the interviews. The view of life "askesiros" (progress) was an approach to village development that was subjective. Subsequently, it considered the development program as the domain and obligation of the government. Contradictory, the village elite felt that they had the right to enjoy the "askesiros" to accelerate program implementation. The development program needed to start from the village that was the idea from the government (Monuh). Its reason was in the past ten years when the programs destroyed vary profit, minimal participation, and assistance. They had shown a decline in the welfare of the needy population. Therefore, in the appreciating of the cultural value and the meaning of "Askesiros" as "Orooroisa" development (flowing down) needed the willingness and sincerity of the village elite, all program managers, and stakeholders.

1. Introduction
Manokwari is a district located on the north coast of the Bird's Head Region of Papua Island. This area divided into 9 districts, and 164 villages. Its regency covers an area of 1,556.94 km² with a population of approximately 173,020 people, according to the census in 2018, with a distribution of 58 people/km². Three villages are Sairo (North Manokwari District), Hanghouw (Tanah Rubu District), and Indesey (Warmare District) easily access them from the capital city of the Manokwari Regency with paved roads. Besides, access from these three villages to the economic centers in the district capital was about ± 60 minutes by using a motorbike or public transportation. They had received aid in the form of safe water. It was acquired from the PNPM Mandiri program and the National Program of Community-Based Water Supply and Sanitation (PAMSIMAS). Other facilities were health centers, elementary schools, and churches (with 99% of the Papua population with Christian beliefs). Yet, data said they still used gardens and rivers for MCK purposes. Data also mentioned they have a low educational level, although they were easy to access the primary to secondary school. Besides, all programs has already been applied since 10 years. Yet, if it was compared with current condition, no big impact is towards to the indigenous and these villages. This paper aimed was to examine the knowledge and experience of villages in constructing a development program. In addition to how it's
subjective and objective targeted the achieving set goals. This paper expected was to give the village poverty alleviation approach in Manokwari Regency, West Papua, based on the level of knowledge and experience of the Papuan.

2. Methods

The research focus was on the knowledge of local actors and the understanding of development programs which regarded to village development. The expected information was to facilitate the implementation of participatory research methods. Afterwards, by using snowball sampling techniques, selected respondents on access limited to overall population information as well as the characteristics used snowball sampling techniques. Sample collected used the convenience, while the interpersonal relationships and connections among people were in applying the snowball sampling technique [1]. The other respondents were the other people interviewed to obtain additional information such as the village head, district assistant, clan/tribal/church leaders, government officials, and NGOs.

The participatory research method was conducted in early June 2019, for four days, with the participants divided into two groups of men and women. Total respondents are 130 respondents. Sairo was 43 respondents, Hanghouw was 43 respondents and Indesey was 44 respondents.

The research location was in Manokwari Regency, West Papua Province, in three villages using the purposive sampling method. Besides, the focus of research was determined with the following consideration: (1) the study location is the villages where the main livelihood of people is farming. It was caused they are vulnerable to poverty, (2) these local villages, easily accessible by land from Manokwari. Thus, it is open to external changes, (3) these villages have experienced several types of poverty alleviation programs such as the IDT, BLT, PUAP, PNPM Mandiri, Pamsimas, the Pajale Self-Sufficiency Program, for the last three years (2016 to 2018), with belong the funding.

The primary data of this research was related to poverty, welfare, priority issues, and institutions. The data reviewed applied focus group discussions (FGD), observations, interviews with local respondents, and questionnaires. On the other hand, secondary data related to policies, programs, and projects, which were from published papers, government reports, and other library resources analyzed using the inductive method.

The initial process was to prepare all data or information obtained from the FGD, questionnaires, and interviews with selected institutions. Subsequently, the stages acquired is followed by grouping in several categories to describe the main issues being investigated and based on the research objectives. Three sorts were poverty and welfare, priority issues, and institutions. The data collected are used to analyze the research problem and the facts obtained [2].

![Figure 1. Research location in manokwari regency](image)
3. Results

3.1. Social construction of the village development program

The concept "askesiros" progress them, as they tend to ascertain its meaning for advanced living standards. Thus, all the resources owned need to optimized for the process of change. This concept is internalized to a way of life by the Arfak tribal villagers. The view of "askesiros" has externalized as a symbol. It emphasized the dominance of the local elite as the ruler and owner of customary rights of a region, with the principled to enjoy the progress exclusively. In this context, they become active, while those in the social structure act as ordinary/non-elite local groups understand it as "Oru eimofoj," which means waiting or hoping for something to come by assisting them to enjoy the progress. In this context, they externalize the values of "askesiros" with a passive attitude. It is a factor that has increasingly emphasized the dominance of the local elite in controlling the development programs in the village. Therefore, it is not uncommon for village development to only be a constellation of diverse attended, and minimal community participation. The development program is objectified to belong to the government. Therefore, the progress needs to start from the village (Monuh). However, the realm of welfare becomes untouched due to various interests. *Ororoisa may be meant flowing down which refers to the context of understanding is that all levels of society in the village are entitled to enjoy the benefits of the development program. This is likened to the flow of torrential river water from top to bottom.*

3.2. The knowledge of local community of the village development program

This research found some programs have weaknesses in implementation, which affected the skill and level of community participation. For example, due to the wide geographical distribution and remoteness of many districts and villages in West Papua, program facilitators have not been able to provide intensive facilitation and supporting, thereby, leading to a lack of knowledge and limited community participation. Also, the facilitators primarily evaluated for program administration performance, such as disbursement of funds, reporting, and the rate of repayment of the revolving loan, did not have the incentive to spend the extra time needed to disseminate the objectives and procedures of the program to the general public. Other factors that influence implementation include a rigid hierarchical social structure with the dominance of entrenched elites, language barriers, and difficulties in involving women in program activities.

Indigenous knowledge of the program in the three research locations was measured by its name, amount, source of funds, the process and stages of implementation, management, investment, rules, and objectives. However, the program’s name was the most commonly known by citizens, followed by knowledge on the number of funds and sources. While the knowledge processed, stages of program implementation and objectives had not been widespread in the community and still concentrated in elite groups, especially the village head, the activity implementation team (Indonesian known as TPKK), officials, as well as the local and traditional leaders. The following data was a statement from a respondent about the fund: "We were only aware of the development activities in the village from the Jokowi’s fund, which used the PNPM Mandiri program. We were aware of its name because it reported by the village head during meetings or program socialization. What was delivered the number of funds? However, there are some funds we don't know the amount. Thus, we thought it was wise to ask the village head or secretary for more details" (NA, 36-year-old).

Most people were limited to the information on the program's name, and only a few knew the amount and source of funds because they had a close relationship with the village elite. However, the village could clearly distinguish between the programs carried out by the central, provincial, or district governments and the relevant agencies. They also knew that there were two different sources of funds in village development, the Special Autonomy (Dana Otsus) from the provincial budget (APBD) and those from the central government (APBN). The difference in knowledge was due to the way the program was socialized and its poor implementation by facilitators, program managers, and village leaders.
elites. The program among communities was attracted by the implementation range and the extent to which the community involved.

Table 1. Knowledge of village communities towards development programs in the village

| Knowledge          | Sairo | Hanghouw | Indesey |
|--------------------|-------|----------|---------|
|                    | E MK  | PA PK    | E MK PA PK |
| Fund               | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ |
| Source of Funds    | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ |
| Process and Stages | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ |
| Activity Manager   | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ |
| Program            | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ |
| Investment         | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ |
| The rules          | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ |
| Aims               | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ |

Note: E = Village Elite; MK = Common People; PA = Active Woman; PK = Common Woman

Women's knowledge of village programs were active in Family Welfare Empowerment (PKK), Maternal and Child Health Services (Posyandu), and local church activities. They were aware of the proposed deliberations, TP KK, and the number of funds allocated for their projects. Some of them also knew their right to aim activities and obtain special funding, while others had no idea due to the dominance of the village elite in decision making. Non-active women only knew the name of the program, and attended meetings, without expressing their opinions. A correspondent said “We (women) are involved in village meetings ... therefore, we are also invited to hear what the government has to say ... they discuss a lot on the program proposal ... while we listen and cannot express our opinions ... only certain people, like village heads or secretaries, are allowed to talk,... furthermore, they tend to use words that we don't understand …” (YM 41 year old, DA 32 year old).

3.3. The reality of village development program
Table 2 shows all elite groups in the three villages have participated in the form of attendance, making proposals, and deliberations. Yet, the general public and active women in the rural of Sairo, in attending the meeting, also made proposals but did not decide. In Hanghouw and Indesey, the community and women who present were not a chance to make suggestions and decisions during deliberations. It was for the entire planning and implementation process controlled by the village elite. The condition occurred was that the preparation of the program was not based on the needs of the general community in the village but fulfilled the various interests of the village elite.

Table 2. Participation of Village Communities in Development Programs in the Village

| Participation        | Sairo | Hanghouw | Indesey |
|----------------------|-------|----------|---------|
|                     | E MK  | PA PK    | E MK PA PK |
| Precense            | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ |
| Give a Suggestion   | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ |
| Participating in     | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ |
| deciding Process and stages | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ | ✓ ✓ ✓ ✓ |

Note: E = Village Elite; MK = Common People; PA = Active Woman; PK = Common Woman

4. Conclusion
The village development program, for the general group, was usually internalized with the view of the life of askesi ros (progress), but in fact, it interpreted as oru eimofoj. It was the externalization of the meaning of advance that referred by hoping or waiting for without proactively working on its
existence. By subjectively, they considered the development program as the realm of government responsibility. The supported derived from program budgets/funds. In this context, objectively are needed to participate in the direct material added value (goods or cash). Village elite groups externalized the *askesiros*, view of life. By being more active in emphasizing their dominance in social stratification as the ruling group and the owner of customary rights. Subjectively, they felt that they have the right to be the first to enjoy the development progress. In this case, it tended to accelerate program implementation, while they objectively tried to limit the involvement of the lower classes. In reality, objectification of village development programs was not appropriate in the interpretation progress. The development program belonged to the government and its interests. Therefore, the development needed to start from the village (Monuh). However, in the field, the realm of welfare becomes untouched due to various interests, and the community only achieved minimal participation. Then, the supply and sincerity of the elite and all stakeholders of the program needed to get the meaning of the cultural value of *askesiros* as a symbol of presenting a development program known as *ororoisa*.
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