

Contextualizing Community Economic Development: Kelurahan Cideng, Kecamatan Gambir, Central Jakarta

Ahmad Gamal¹

¹ Department of Architecture, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Indonesia, Indonesia
gamal@eng.ui.ac.id

ABSTRACT

This paper is aimed at contextualizing the approach of Community Based Development as an alternative solution of communities to reduce dependency to the outer forces. It is conducted by examining a heavily urbanized area in Central Jakarta and to compare it with different scales of contexts. *Kelurahan Cideng* has very unique context since its urban environment has particular population composition of the dichotomic extremes: the poor and the rich as well as those involved in formal and informal employment. The study treats a national government's policy of the integration of *Posyandu*, BKK and provincial initiative of PAUD as the interplay with the socio-economic context of *Cideng*.

© 2018 IJBESR. All rights reserved.

Keywords: Community-based Development, Economic Development, Formal, Informal, Planning

1. Introduction

Generally the concept of community has been used to identify "the sense of direct common concern" materialized in various form of organization [1]. However, defining communities, meaning giving limitations to its wide possibility of understanding and range of coverage is as difficult as defining Community Economic Development itself. Especially in an urban context where there is lack of primary ties to locality, breakdown of primary groups, reliance on secondary forms of social control (such as police), destruction of family, diversity in values and beliefs, and universal rules [2] social organization of people is becoming less and less definite and the idea of its existence has been challenged and perhaps, relied more on ideas and action rather than actual exclusive social organization [1].

The idea of (economic) development has also been challenged as the thrust of capital is embedded in the development of forces of production [3]. Therefore, the main interest of

capitalist development has been to serve development of capital itself rather than to serve human development. Furthermore, as human labor has been visualized as part of production input, smaller wage and unequal distribution of production profit has been disguised as efficient economics, and the result has been manifested in severe inequalities in wealth [4] as well as the practice of discrimination and domination of race and gender [5] or configurative structure of all of the above [6]. Alternatives has been proposed by scholars, such as the idea of encouraging non-monetized exchange by community self-help activity and volunteering [7] or providing alternative economic spaces by fostering principles of co-operation, non-profit, socially oriented economics [8]. Generally, there has been acceptance among scholars that to survive the competing environment of capitalistic economics, communities must collect resources and act as a whole rather than as individuals.

Because of different contexts, communities need to react differently to the mainstream of

exchange (capitalistic) economics. [9] argues that to foster Community Economic Development, communities must first set their priorities, either strengthening **community** bonding, accelerating **economic** growth, or encouraging **development** and change in social structures. They also argue that the conservative growth planning (in the sphere of capitalistic economy) is counterproductive to communalization or human development as it works in the assumption that growth (of capital, new employment, per capita income and other conservative economic indicators) is always good for the community while in fact, it can also cause marginalization and the loss of solidarity between community members.

This study is depicting *Kelurahan Cideng* because its particular urban context has been a very good example of a population in great stress. In a heavily urbanized area relying its economic growth on commerce, a number of population lives under poverty line with no access to either formal jobs or formal housing. This population depicts typical urban poor of Jakarta who, day by day, is faced with severe inequality as middle-upper class houses are located only across the river of *Cideng*. This particular context is clearly showing that as economic growth is highly successful, a particular part of population becomes marginalized by the economic gap and the area is in a greater need for human development rather than more economic growth.

2. Material and Method

Contextualizing Community: Defining Cideng

2.1. Administrative Definitions of Cideng Community

As mentioned above, in an urban context it is particularly difficult to define a community and find its geographic or social borders. The first approach to contextualize a community can be done by gradually eliminating larger administrative circles of population.

Administratively, the name of *Cideng* is recognized as a *Kelurahan*, that is, by Law no. 5, 1979, regarding Village Government, is the lowest rank of administration hierarchy of Indonesian government [10]. The residents of *Cideng* recognize the government and its representative office as their closest imaginary-boundary of their group. The population of *Cideng* as of January 2008 reaches 16,951 within only 1.26 km² area, leaving *Cideng* a high density with 13,453 people/km² [11].

However, the social grouping of Indonesian population is a little more complicated since the society also recognizes *Rukun Warga* (Community Association) and *Rukun Tetangga* (Neighborhood Association). The BPS (Indonesian Statistical Bureau) defines RT and RW as:

“...Two common types of organization formed by community members acknowledged and supported by the government meant to preserve the traditional values of Indonesian people which are based on the principles of familism and community self-help and to help enhance the implementation of administration and development program in villages (desa/kelurahan). Each RT in desa should have no more than 30 households or 50 households in kelurahan. RT and RW are established based on the Ministry of Home Affairs Regulation no. 7, 1983: regarding the establishment of rukun tetangga and rukun warga.

The government therefore, recognizes the society's tendency to form community groups. The RT/RW does not exist exclusively for the internal affairs of the community, but the government as well. A new resident, for example, must seek approval from his/her community's RT/RW elected officer to be recognized as the community member before proceeding to the administrative office of the *Kelurahan* to apply for KTP (*Kartu Tanda Penduduk*, Identity Card) allowing him/her to access all government services. The elected official of an RT/RW, then, is **playing a dual**

role of formal/informal leadership of the people within his/her neighborhood and community. Because an RT/RW official is elected, in order to form the Association, residents must gather and collect resources. It is quite safe to say then, that when an RT/RW is running well, there is sufficient reciprocity of responsibility from the residents, and therefore, the resident group can be identified as a solid community. In Indonesia, RT/RW has been transformed not just as an administrative category for residential grouping, but community belonging identification as well.

2.2. Historical Background of Cideng Community

Master Plan 1973 (Master Plan For Drainage and Flood Control of Jakarta, later on revised in 1981) played a very important part to the change of the neighborhood of *Cideng*. This Master Plan documented the need to build "Collector Drains" to contain and pass on excess river water to Flood Canals. The Master Plan commanded the construction of *Cideng* Water Facility to contain excess water from *kali Cideng Bawah* and distribute it to West Flood Canal [12] [13]. The Master Plan ordered District Governments within the area of the Planned Flood Canals to start shifting private land ownerships into government-owned land. This process is widely known as the practice of *ganti-rugi* literally means "loss-compensation". It is truly a loss for people whose house stood on the future area of the *Cideng* Water Facility because generally *ganti rugi* compensated their property under market value. Those who had permanent houses received *ganti rugi* while those who had no physical evidence of house ownership was forced to move in the event of *penggusuran* (eviction). The practice of *penggusuran* by government was very common to be done as at that time Suharto (former President) ruled with dictatorship and even up to date the practice is still common. [14] predicted that more than 200,000 families along Jakarta riverbanks would be the future collaterals of this practice.

Fachruddin, elected vice official for RW 06, in the interview tells me the story of the drastic change of the neighborhood:

"It was around year 1987 (or '88, I don't really remember) when the construction of the Water Facility was started. The street in front of my house was a small alley within a very nice Betawi (Jakarta native) neighborhood. We had some Chinese neighbors as well. When the Facility was to be built, people had to move. Some people moved to smaller houses around this neighborhood, but some others just had to move somewhere else.

When the fly-over bridge next to Water Facility was built and as the street became wider, I saw big houses were converted to offices and storages. Gubug (shacks) started to invade the foundation area of the bridge. First there was only one, and then the others came along. Some of them worked for the offices around here, some twenty of them worked for the Kelurahan as garbage collectors, some of them became street traders or bajaj (three wheeled taxi) drivers. One of them had more money and opened a wartel (private telephone booth). I think it is dying now, as almost all people now have their own cell-phones. Even the poorest of them has one to call his family in the village."

Cideng possibly got its name from the old river of *Cihideung*. From the two Indonesian words for river, residents more commonly used *kali* rather than *sungai* to refer to *Cideng*. The meaning of *kali* is pejorated by time, now bearing a negative connotation. *Kali* refers to narrow water flow, often full of sewage, with unpleasant color and smell, a very good description of how *Kali Cideng* at present looks alike. *Kali Cideng* stretches from South East to North West, dividing *Kelurahan Cideng* into two parts. The adjacent North East part of the *kali* belongs to RW 06, while the adjacent South West part belongs to RW 07. *Kali Cideng* is not the only separator of RW 07 and RW 06. Between the two communities, a rail track and the extension of West Flood Canal runs parallel to *Kali Cideng*. The very narrow land between

the rail track and the West Flood Canal is now invaded by hundreds of informal houses, as the home of those with no access to formal housing. Those in this parcel of land now group themselves as RW 07.

Their relationship with the Government has been a very interesting interaction to study. As they have no possibility to cross the *Kali Cideng*, the informal dwellers have built bridges above the West Flood Canal at their own collective expenses.

Most of the houses have been assuring energy supply by stealing from electricity towers. Aside from the stinky, smelly *kali* water, the informal dwellers have been drilling the land to seek for clean water for human consumption. They have never been able to expect neither the District nor Municipal Government to provide such facilities because their presence, no matter how significant in number, would never be legalized as they were dwelling the land that legally belonged to the Public Train Company (*PT Kereta Api*).



Figure 1: Physical condition of *Kelurahan Cideng*
 Source: (Private Documentation, 2008)

However, most of the dwellers have had access to KTP (ID Card) by becoming a member of the Community Association (RW). The ownership of KTP has been very important because poor Jakarta residents have been granted free medical treatment only by showing KTP and *Surat Miskin* (Proof Letter of Poverty Status, granted by *Kelurahan*). In Indonesia, an ID Card stated clearly where someone resides. Therefore, there has been a **duality of Jakarta Municipal Government's attitude** towards

informal dwellers. On one side, there has been a legal pressure not to recognize their practice of land invasion as the “correct” way of dwelling, but on the other hand there has been a great moral pressure to still grant identification (which practically means recognition of their *de facto* residency) consequently providing access to health facility and services.

3. Results and Discussion

Contextualizing Community: Defining Cideng

3.1. Larger Context: (Central) Jakarta and Indonesia

As the prime city and the capital of Indonesia, almost all Indonesian businesses are agglomerated in Jakarta. Therefore it is quite typical that it has been scoring more density in businesses than any other cities all over the Nation. Jakarta has been for centuries relied on trading.

The proportion of trade businesses in Jakarta (40.45%) has been very close to national average (45.29%). Businesses in the fields of accommodation, food and beverages have been far over National Average, followed by the high numbers of real estate property development and unsurprisingly public services and financial intermediary.

Table 1. Comparison of Businesses: Jakarta vs Indonesia

Business	Jakarta		Indonesia	
	In numbers	In %	In numbers	In %
By Type of Activities				
Mining and Quarrying	203	0.02	266,494	1.17
Manufacturing Industries	37,822	3.33	3,220,156	14.16
Electricity, Gas and Water Supply	84	0.01	15,691	0.07
Construction	5,334	0.47	166,328	0.73
Wholesale	459,355	40.45	10,297,909	45.29

Trade, Retail Trade					
Accommodation, Food, Beverages	287,615	25.33	3,015,206	13.26	
Transportation, Storage, and Communication	128,438	11.31	2,702,574	11.89	
Financial Intermediary	5,658	0.50	83,991	0.37	
Real Estate, Business Services	104,912	9.24	804,146	3.54	
Educational Services	10,440	0.92	341,556	1.50	
Health Services and Social Activity	6,571	0.58	178,880	0.79	
Public Services, Social, and Personal Services	77,313	6.81	1,465,197	6.44	
Individual Service which Serve Households	11,745	1.03	179,186	0.79	
By Scale					
Large Scale Establishment (annual revenue more than Rp. 3. bill. = \$300,000)	8,925	0.79	44,038	0.19	
Medium Scale Establishment (annual revenue between Rp. 1 bill. – Rp. 3 bill)	19,762	1.74	152,789	0.67	
Small Scale Establishment (annual revenue between Rp. 50 mill. – Rp. 1 bill.)	365,504	32.19	3,594,254	15.81	
Micro Scale Establishment (annual revenue less than Rp. 50 mill. = \$5,000)	739,409	65.12	18,933,701	83.27	
Unclassified	1,890	0.17	12,532	0.06	
Total Bussinesses	1,135,490	100	22,737,314	100	

Source: (BPS, 2006)

The types of businesses mentioned above may have clearly represented Jakarta as a more urbanized area compared to other areas in Indonesia. However, interestingly the proportion of businesses by size does not represent that much of a difference. Most of

Jakarta businesses remain as either small or micro scale. Certain areas of businesses may be untouched by large corporations and capital investments and, in many cases, remain in handled size of small, may be family operations.

Areas like Central Jakarta survives with combination of large trading industries and numerous small-scale, and home-based operated businesses. Manufacturing industries, although profitable and absorb many workers, have been competing with other functions in the central city and in the end, found themselves dispersed in Jakarta outskirts. Lots of these businesses employ small number of workers, most of them are self-employed and the nature of these industries is informal. As predicted, on the top of the list are businesses with less skill requirements. The number may be understated as the informality of these businesses has made it difficult to be registered and documented. Lots of types of self-employed “work” which basically capitalize the worker’s own labor force may be also not recognized as businesses (shoe shiner, freelance jobs, construction workers, shop attendant). People in this category have been lost from formal documentations since they are considered not working for either formal/informal sector.

Table 2. Home-based industries in Central Jakarta

Industries	In numbers	In %
Taylor Services	739	39.41
Tempe Production	690	36.80
Printing Services	229	12.21
Car/Motor Repair	64	3.41
Food & Beverages	39	2.08
Welding Workshops	35	1.87
Bread Production	28	1.49
Housing Appliances	23	1.23
Leather Goods	21	1.12
Meatballs	2	0.11
Noodles	2	0.11
Traditional Soap	2	0.11
Tofu	1	0.05
Total	1,875	100

Table 3. Population aged 15 above who work by level of education

Population	Jakarta		Indonesia	
	In numbers	In %	In number	In %
None at all	16,066	0.45	5,518,811	5.81
Some years in Elementary School	97,523	2.74	12,453,571	13.12
Elementary School	673,547	18.89	35,418,816	37.3
Middle School	724,491	20.32	17,193,368	18.11
Technical Middle School	29,090	0.82	1,365,270	1.44
High School	914,773	25.66	11,566,173	12.18
Technical High School	603,896	16.94	6,282,325	6.62
Two years College Diplome	43,161	1.21	974,701	1.03
Three years College Diplome	162,644	4.56	1,198,522	1.26
Higher education at University	300,140	8.42	2,976,561	3.13
Total	3,565,331	100	94,948,118	100

Source: (District Government of Central Jakarta, 2008)

3.2. Local Context: Observable “Work” Sphere of RW 06/RW07 Kelurahan Cideng

As explained above RW 06 and RW 07 is separated by the Flood Canal. Most RW 07 residents live in large houses (300 m² or more), some of them have been transformed into storehouses. Meanwhile dominant residents of RW 06 are freelance, less-educated, less-skilled workers, and their houses often are less than 20m², usually lived by three to four household members. Some of them who could not find governmental jobs as try to open food stall with daily subsistence basis. The food produced must be sold the same day in order to produce again the next day. Some others with smaller capital open cigarette booths. All type of practice is recognized as “warung” (literally “small store”). There is large concentration of *bajaj* drivers and garbage workers in this area.

In inactive hours there’s no less than 20 garbage carts and 20 *bajajs* pooled under the fly-over bridge in this area. Most of the *warungs* have direct and consistent costumers, the *bajaj* drivers or garbage workers of their own surrounding neighbors. One resident has been able to collect some money to open a *wartel* (*warung telekomunikasi*, private telephone booth), a dying business at present. Informants had mentioned that some of other residents do first-entry, low-paid jobs around Central Jakarta. Most of these workers are late urban-rural migrants (less than ten years ago), along with the great wave of immigration to Jakarta in the last two decades, more than 3 million between 1980-1990 and more than 3.5 million between 1990 and 2000 [10].



Figure 3. Local Economic Activities
 Source: (Private Documentation, 2008)



Figure 4. Local economic
 Source: Private Documentation (Gemala, 2008)

4. Conclusion

Contextualizing Community: Defining Cideng

4.1. Human (and) Development

Observing and comparing Jakarta and Indonesia’s Human Development Index is very interesting. Although Jakarta is the capital city, there is no significant difference in the measures of Human Development Indexes in terms of life expectancy, knowledge (normally

measured by literacy rate) and standard of living. In 2007, even Jakarta scored 13.27 % of unemployment rate, higher than 9.75 % of the national unemployment rate [17].

Although Gender development Index, the proportional comparison of the HDI among gender shows acceptable rate, low participation and decision-making power in economic and political roles (in both the community or the society as a whole) have dropped the rate of gender empowerment in Jakarta as compared to national rate [15].

Table 4. Human Development Index

Parameters	Jakarta				Indonesia			
	1999	2002	2004	2005	1999	2002	2004	2005
Life Expectancy (Maximum Age)	71.1	72.3	72.4	72.5	66.2	66.2	67.6	68.1
Literacy Rate (Percents)	97.8	98.2	98.3	98.3	88.4	89.5	90.4	90.9
Mean Years of Schooling	9.7	10.4	10.4	10.6	6.7	7.1	7.2	7.3
Adjusted per Capita Real Expenditure (in thousands Rp.)	593.4	616.9	618.1	619.5	578.8	591.2	614.1	619.9
Poverty Index	15.5	13.2	-	-	15.2	22.7	-	-
Gender Empowerment Index	46.4	50.3	-	-	-	54.6	-	-
Gender Development Index	61.2	65.7	-	-	-	59.2	-	-
Human Development Index	72.5	75.6	-	76.1	64.3	65.8	-	69.6

Source: (Statistics Indonesia, 2008)

Observing and comparing Jakarta and Indonesia's Human Development Index is very interesting. Although Jakarta is the capital city, there is no significant difference in the measures of Human Development Indexes in terms of life expectancy, knowledge (normally measured by literacy rate) and standard of

living. In 2007, even Jakarta scored 13.27 % of unemployment rate, higher than 9.75 % of the national unemployment rate [17].

Although Gender development Index, the proportional comparison of the HDI among gender shows acceptable rate, low participation and decision-making power in economic and political roles (in both the community or the society as a whole) have dropped the rate of gender empowerment in Jakarta as compared to national rate [15].

4.2. Specific Parameters for Development

As predicted, the high unemployment rate, high poverty rate and low education attainment rate affects specific parameters for the new generations. 14% of Infant Mortality Rate compared to 32% National Rate may sounds good, but definitely not high enough for a highly urbanized area with 95.59 % paramedic attendance at birth. Suspicion should be addressed to the malnutrition of pregnant bearers, or women's and pregnancy health in general. Even though there is high life expectancy at birth, the high risk of baby bearing for women and families have dropped the Total Net Reproduction Rate to only 0.79% from 1.54 % of Total Fertility. Generally, Jakarta is in low level of women and infant health.

Table 5. Specific parameters for women & infant (%)

Measures	Jakarta	Indonesia
Infant Mortality Rate [16]	14	32
Life Expectancy at Birth [17]	72.5	68.5
Percentage of Birth with Paramedic Attendance [18]	95.59	66.14
Percentage of Women Using Contraceptive [18]	72.25	74.05
(Estimation) Total Fertility [19]	1.54	2.17
(Estimation) Total Infant Mortality [19]	10.95	26.89
(Estimation) Total Net Reproduction [19]	0.79	1.05

Sources: Badan Pusat Statistik, 2008

The data presented above is a general statistics of the whole Jakarta population. The figures

may be underestimated in “high risk” communities such as in RW 06 *Kelurahan Cideng*, where most of residents are in low education attainment, low-paid jobs and insecure in terms of housing and environment.

Using Policy Tools

4.3. Existing Policies: Responding Issues of Mother and Infant Health

Generally, from the perspective of human development, Jakarta as well as Indonesia faces four major problems: a) the low level of education attainment level; b) the low involvement of women in decision making process in terms of economic resources as well as daily livelihood in family and community; c) low level of participation in skilled labor force; and d) low level of infant care. The case of *Kelurahan Cideng* has shown that low education attainment level has forced residents to join less-skilled, low-paid labor. The combination of low education attainment and low cash has reduced attention to infant’s health and education, and therefore starts the next cycle of poverty. All these problems should not be addressed individually but rather as *interplays*.

One of Government’s initiatives as a response to the interplay of the four factors is the *Posyandu* (*Pos Pelayanan Terpadu*, Integrated Services Post). This center is **run by members of the community** and provides range of Family, Mother and Infant services, such as Family Planning, Mother and Child Health, Nutrition, Immunization, Diarrhea Disease Control and nutrition education and services. Specifically this center is designed to achieve the following objectives: 1) to monitor child growth and development; 2) to provide oral rehydration; 3) to promote breast-feeding; 4) to administer immunization for children; 5) to educate the mothers in *Bina Keluarga Balita* (Education for Families with Infants); 6) to provide supplementary foods for children; and

7) to improve family nutrition [20]. One *Posyandu* serves approximately 100 children age 0-5 years. Its services sometimes need to be adjusted to the capability of local volunteers and local conditions. In some areas in Indonesia with particularly challenging geographical conditions, less density and more distance between dwellings, less number of households, etc. In March 1984, Indonesia launched the Integrated Family Planning and Health mission and the execution of this mission has been involving *Posyandu* in great extent. In 2005, the number of *Posyandus* reached 245,758 [21].

The success of this program cannot be separated from the success of another initiative, that is the PKK (*Pendidikan Kesejahteraan Keluarga, Family Welfare Education, recently changed to Family Welfare Empowerment*), a program at village level to educate women on various aspects of family welfare [22]. There is probably no such effective initiative like PKK in any other country since the cadres has reached almost all RT/RW all over Indonesia in all level of community administrations. The smallest group of PKK consists of 10-20 women from local community household. They are helping each other in information and resources, called the *Dasawisma* [23]. The investment on PKK has not only been financial but organizational as well. The Jargon of “*ibu-ibu PKK*” (PKK Women) has been very famous to Indonesians to refer to the initiatives activists and partisans.

The program was considered successful by international organizations and therefore, attracts major donors. After severe economic crisis of 1997, UNICEF has started Rapid Response Complementary Food Initiative (CFI), distributed 500 g packets of micronutrient fortified complementary food “*Vitadele (VTDL)*” through *Posyandu* to benefit over 150.000 infants for a period of six months [24]. This has become a start off for *Posyandu* Revitalization Program, which was enforced by Instruction of Minister of Internal

Affairs and Regional Autonomy, June 13th 2001 (Info PADU, 2005: 70). An element of the USAID-sponsored CHOICE (Child Health Opportunities Integrated with Community Empowerment) program, Posyandu TKA has helped nearly 2300 children under the age of five through the twice-weekly sessions [25].

Interestingly, this program has not been only beneficial for infant health but also to the empowerment of women. In many regions of Indonesia, gender development has been so imbalanced that domestic life has been the only choice for women. *Being active in community organization and positive feeling of appreciation from the community served* has been expressions of women interviewed in many parts of Indonesia [26].

4.4. National Initiatives: Responding the Need of Early Education

Because the development of early intelligence is simultaneous to nutrition consumption [21], the National Government of Indonesia has shifted its paradigm towards education and development. There is systematic effort to integrate PAUD (*Pendidikan Anak Usia Dini*, Early Education Program, which has been a domain of private sector for long time, into *Posyandus*. The consequence of this is that the government provides communities with greater control and resources for the development of their localities with main principles of reciprocity, responsibility, and self-help. The government only acts as motivator and financial supporter [23].

The new formulation of any Community Activity will be involving three main aspect and responsibility: 1) *Posyandu* is responsible for nutrition and health information and treatment for pregnant women, mothers and infants; 2) BKB is responsible for family welfare education to community members, and; 3) PAUD is responsible on conducting Early Education Program for infants and children in

the community [27]. These initiatives are usually conducted under coordination with PKK women “cadre”. The most important aspect of the integration is that all stimulus to infants must be conducted by parents themselves (Ibid: 28). Guidance from a PKK cadre is provided in the process, and parents can imitate the stimulus given by PKK cadre to increase infants’ development on physical growth, verbal communication, cognitive-socio-emotional skills, creative and self-supportive attitude (Ibid: 29). Parents do not just benefit from the activity but also *actively learn* about family education and nutrition requirement for children [28].

4.5. Local Initiatives: Gathering Resources in Cideng

The most interesting part of this initiative to integrate *Posyandu* to PAUD and BKB is that the community activity is now having such big burden of o many responsibilities. In case of *Kelurahan Cideng*, the PKK cadres have not increased in significant numbers although their responsibilities have been doubled. The main cadres are only 9 women each is responsible to monitor 10-20 households within their community. Therefore the members of BKB, *Posyandu*, and PAUD are basically same persons who swap positions. In RW 06, for example, Atik Azhari, the PKK Cadre Coordinator herself, serves only as member for BKB and *Posyandu*, but also serves as the Coordinator for PAUD. The main activists are those with multiple positions such as Sriyatni Rachim (Secretary for BKB and Teacher for PAUD), and Nawangsih (Treasurer and Teacher for PAUD and member of BKB). Although other six members serve as part-time volunteers only, all of the volunteers are provided with a “certificate of appointment” from *Cideng’s Lurah* (Head of Subdistrict). This is possibly done to anticipate reluctance of commitment, and at the same time a form of appreciation from the community. As pointed above, money is not the most important reward

for these community members as appreciation shows larger impact on confidence in decision-making and other positive psychological state of mind. Sriyatni, in one of the interviews said:

"I don't mind volunteering without being paid. I am a poor widow. People look down at me. By volunteering I feel I am worthy to the community. People see me differently now. They regard me as someone who helps the community. They take away all prejudices".

Almost all community members who benefits from the PAUD program donate with very minimum amount of money of Rp. 20,000.00 (\$2/month) to support daily teaching-learning activity in PAUD. Those who cannot afford will have free access to PAUD or other PKK activities while richer community members cross subsidize them. Nawangsih, the treasurer for PAUD, is also recognized as the biggest contributor of donations for the activity. The government through *Kelurahan* provides starter funds of Rp. 25 million (\$2,500.00). PKK Cideng used this money to provide interaction medias for PAUD's activities. Interaction medias include gaming tools, songbooks, music recordings and audio devices, storybooks, and almost all school appliances. Only Rp. 6 million (\$6,000.00) from the starter fund is allocated as incentive for 12 teachers for the whole year of 2008 (leaving only Rp. 50,000.00 or \$5 left for each every month!). Only when PAUD planned big activities such as excursions to designated learning facility (library, parks, etc) the government will provide extra funding by the procedure of competing proposals. All activities are conducted in the Community Centre in a multifunction room of 30m². The Centre is also built by donation of community members. Those who have no cash donate their labor for the construction. Therefore, practically the activity is very much based on community's own resources.

Humble operation is daily view of PAUD Cideng. So far PAUD in RW 06 has provided

three groups of classes. The playgroup with age range between 0-2 years has 8 students, and active from 03.30 – 05.00 pm every Monday, Wednesday and Friday. The "A" group with age range between 2-4 years has 27 students and group "B" with age range 4-6 has 23 students. For the reason of inadequate space, "A" class starts at 07.30 am and ends at 09.45 am. Class "B" starts at 10 am and ends at 12 am. The only interaction media found in the room is just few songbooks and storybooks. Outdoor facility includes one poorly paved park and one metal child-play construction.

All students come from economically marginalized families since the wealthy families send their children to private and public schools. From 68 students, 12 of the students come from RW 05, and 57 of them come from RW 06 families. Only 6 of them are from RW 07, the poorest RW in *Kelurahan Cideng* living in informal houses between the Flood Canal and the railroad, with 3043 members in 731 households, 40% of them work as low-paid freelance workers. Therefore, the range of coverage of this initiative is still very low in its first year of establishment, less than one % of participation from the most needy community [29].

5. References

- [1] Gottlieb, Robert. 2007. *Reinventing Los Angeles*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press
- [2] Palen, John J. 2008. "The Rise of Urban America." In *The Urban World*. 8th edition. Boulder, CO: Paradigm Publishers
- [3] Chilcote, Ronald H. 1984. *Theories of Development and Underdevelopment*. Westview Press
- [4] Sklar, Holly. 1995 *Chaos or Community?* South End Press.
- [5] Glenn, Evelyn Nakano 2002 *Unequal Freedom How Race and gender Shaped American Citizenship and Labor*. Cambridge: Harvard University Press
- [6] McCall, Leslie 2001, *Complex Inequality. Gender Class and Race in the new Economy* New York and London: Routledge
- [7] Williams, Colin C. 2005. *A Commodified World? Mapping the Limits of Capitalism*. London & New York: Zed Books
- [8] Williams, Colin C, Teresa Aldreidge and Jane Tooke. 2003. *Alternative Exchange Spaces in Leyshon*, Andrew. Roger Lee and Colin C Williams. *Alternative Economic Spaces*. London: Sage Publications. pp151-167

- [9] Boothroyd, Peter and H. Craig Davis. *Community Economic Development: Three Approaches*. in *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 12. pp 230-240; 1993
- [10] Badan Pusat Statistik (BPS) Indonesia (Indonesian Statistic Bureau), *Statistics Glossary*, <http://www.bps.go.id/cgi-bin/glossary/faqmanager.cgi>, accessed October 15, 2008, 6.35pm
- [11] Situs Resmi Pemerintah Walikotamadya Jakarta Pusat (Official Website of District Government of Central Jakarta), *Industri di Jakarta Pusat*, <http://pusat.jakarta.go.id>, accessed October 15, 2008, 7.12pm
- [12] Sobirin, *Banjir Jakarta Sepanjang Jaman*, Saturday, July 28, 2007, <http://sobirin-xyz.blogspot.com/2007/07/banjir-jakarta-sepanjang-jaman.html>, accessed October 15, 2008, 7.22pm
- [13] Londo, Paulus. *Banjir Kanal Barat vs Banjir circa 1922. Strategi Prof Dr H van Breen Menyelamatkan Jakarta dari Banjir*. Kompas, Tuesday, February 5th 2002. <http://benedikthasoloan.com/blog/weblog.php?id=10>, accessed October 15, 2008, 9.23pm
- [14] Urban Poor Consortium, *Pengurusan*, <http://upc.uplink.or.id/pengurusan/jakarta.htm>, accessed October 15, 2008, 8.22pm
- [15] United Nations Development Program (UNDP), *Technical Notes on Human Development Index*, http://hdr.undp.org/en/media/hdr_20072008_tech_note_1.pdf, accessed October 7, 2008, 5.35pm
- [16] Statistics Indonesia. 2008. *Indonesia Population Projection, 2000-2025*. Jakarta: BPS
- [17] Statistics Indonesia. 2008. *Human Development Index, 2004-2005*. Jakarta: BPS
- [18] Statistics Indonesia. 2008. *Welfare Statistics, 2005*. Jakarta: BPS
- [19] Statistics Indonesia. 2008. *Population Projection of Province in Indonesia 2005-2015*. Jakarta: BPS
- [20] UNESCO. *Indonesia's Education for All*. <http://portal.unesco.org/education/es/files/22302/1095855710/3indonesia1.pdf/indonesia1.pdf>, accessed October 18, 2008, 5.32pm
- [21] Djalal, Fasli. "Government's Policy for Revitalization of Early Childhood Services", in *Bulletin PADU, Scientific Journal for Early Childhood*, Vol. 4 no.1/April 2005
- [22] RAND, http://www.rand.org/labor/bps.data/datadocpdf/podes/podes83_glossary.pdf, accessed October 1, 2008, 6.35pm
- [23] Sabarno, RA Dewi Hari. "Family Wealth and Empowerment through Early Education Program", in *Bulletin PADU, Scientific Journal for Early Childhood*, Vol. 4 no.1/April 2005
- [24] United Nations Children and Education Foundation (UNICEF), *2002 IDS: Evaluation of Posyandu Revitalization*, http://www.unicef.org/evaldatabase/files/IDS_02_001.pdf, accessed October 13, 2008, 7.22pm
- [25] United States AID (USAID), *USAID Gives Pandeglang Children a Head Start*, <http://indonesia.usaid.gov/en/Article.218.aspx>, accessed October 6, 2008, 9.22pm
- [26] Center for Communication Program, John Hopkins School of Public Policy, <http://www.jhuccp.org/training/scope/starguide/data/Hyperbolic%20Tree/Posyandu.htm>, accessed October 14, 2008, 9.13pm
- [27] Suryadi, Ace. "Integrating PAUD (Early Education program) with BKB (Education for Families with Infants) and Posyandu (Integrated Services Post)", in *Bulletin PADU, Scientific Journal for Early Childhood*, Vol. 4 no.1/April 2005
- [28] Azahari, Ratnasari. "Preparing Potential Human Resources through Education for Family with Infants", in *Bulletin PADU, Scientific Journal for Early Childhood*, Vol. 4 no.1/April 2005
- [29] PAUD *Cideng. Fund Starter Proposal*, July 2 2008.

(This page is intentionally left blank)