CBOs and Collective Action:
Can Poor Urban Residents Rely on It?

Tutik Rachmawati, S.IP., MA.[1]

Abstrak

Keberadaan sebuah Organisasi Berbasis Masyarakat dalam sebuah entitas negara seringkali disalahgunakan oleh pemegang kekuasaan untuk mendapatkan image positif tentang tingkat partisipasi masyarakat dan desentralisasi. Namun masih terdapat perdebatan mengenai apakah Organisasi Berbasis Masyarakat sungguh memainkan peranan penting sebagai wadah untuk menggerakkan masyarakat perkotaan. Tulisan ini akan menganalisa relevansi Organisasi Berbasis Masyarakat dalam melakukan collective action untuk memperjuangkan penyediaan pelayanan publik yang baik.

Keyword: *Community Based Organizations, Collective Action, Public Services.*

Preface

This paper addresses the issue of CBOs' role in organizing poor urban residents to take up collective action and in representing people's interest in negotiating with NGOs and LGs. The first chapter is the introduction. The second chapter briefly discusses the nature and characteristic of CBOs in comparison to the nature and characteristic of NGO.

---

[1] *Tutik Rachmawati, S.IP., MA* is Lecturer of Public Administration Department, Parahyangan Catholic University Bandung, Indonesia

Chapter 3 discusses the justifications on the theoretical basis whether CBOs do play a key role in organizing and mobilizing poor urban residents or are there any alternative for collective action instead of in a form of organizing CBOs. The second part of this chapter discusses the nature of relationship among CBOs, NGOs and Local Governments in local development. Why is it difficult for those three actors to cooperate and work together for the betterment of the whole residents?

In chapter 4, three case studies are presented as the reflection on how the role of CBOs in community. The purpose of these case studies is to give clearer understanding and to find out the relationship between NGOs and CBOs, between CBOs and the local Government. CBO's role in organizing people in community, do CBOs work together with NGO or do they work as the mean of Local Government. And the last chapter is the conclusion.

Introduction: Community Based Organizations (CBOs)

It is hard to get precise definition of Community Based Organization (CBO). Limited references are available to address the definition of CBO. Thomas A. in M. Wuyts, M. Macintosh & T. Hewitt (1992) uses local NGO to define 'people's organization' or 'grassroots organizations' or in another word CBO.

According to the UN HABITAT, CBOs are defined as:

> "These are organizations based in and working in one or more local communities (neighborhoods or district); they are normally private, charitable (non profit) organizations which are run by and for the local community. Typically they were created in response to some particular local need or situation - often related to the local environment - and they usually support a variety of specific local improvement actions (for instance, environmental upgrading youth education, employment promotion, etc) which are generally undertaken by or with the local people. CBOs are usually important stakeholders and should be represented on Working Groups for issues of relevance to them as well as being

active participants in other activities of the participatory decision making process" (UN HABITAT, 2001)

In the same sense, R. Tandon in his article of "Grass Root Democracy" (1997) mentions the specific characteristic of local institutions. Based on CBOs nature, they focus on specific issues: water, health, hygiene, education, children, social functions, agriculture, crime, peace and protection of environment.

In this definition, CBOs are understood as development driven organizations, they exist in order to complete the development mission undertaken by community. In broader frame, development practitioners like UNCHS consider them as important stakeholders therefore should be include in every activity to support participation from grass root.

The World Bank (2003) defined CBOs in comparison with NGOs as;

> "... A voluntary association of people living in a particular area (street and village) established for joint social activities and participation in work mutual self help governance structures and mechanism for information exchange. Usually CBOs are membership organizations, when members unit with common problems and interests (for example, women clubs credit unions, youth organizations, farmer organizations, etc...). CBO agenda normally includes short term objectives with specifically measured impact or outcome within particular area or household. In contrast, NGOs have longer term objectives qualified managerial assets and more extent projects or program spar and area....Community based organizations (CBOs) are terms commonly used for the local entities made up of people whose lives are to be enhanced by development efforts. They can generate their own resources based and in principle self-sustainable. As people based organizations they can be directly representative and mandate to speak and act on behalf of members' interest".

CBOs are understood as having short term objectives and only work on specifically measured impact or outcome. However, the role of CBOs as the representative and hold mandate from the member is the prominent role, which is very important in terms of CBOs legitimacy when they deal with other actors in local development.

It is important for not making any dual understanding of CBOs. Generally speaking CBO is community organizations which have several characteristics. The first and the most distinct characteristic is that CBOs aim at self- help, this means that members and beneficiaries are one and the same, NGO on the other hand is describe as private voluntary organization or intermediary organization which is aim at assisting others through support services, facilitation, advocacy in which the membership or the activist is different from the beneficiaries.

CBO is non professional organization. Berner (1997:132) argued *"As long as you are a resident you are automatically a member"*. In other way it can be stated that the member of CBO is recruited because they are the member of the society in which this CBO is emerging. In other word, R. Tandon said that this type of organization is based on voluntary membership, and this voluntary nature provides a level of energy and commitment which acts as a fuel for the functioning of this association.

The next important characteristic is that CBO reflects local perspective and much more focus than any other organization. It brings consequences as a very inclusive community organization because it will only address the issues or interest of its own community. It deals with real everyday life of every people in that community but it does not necessarily serve a big coverage of society. Lastly, CBOs maintain a largely informal basis of functioning. NGO, on the other hand is semi professional organization. Often we can find one particular NGO has several branch in a very diverse activities in a particular country, or at least on NGO has area coverage of the whole city. This reflects the characteristic of NGO as supra-local perspective and focus. In term of leadership, R. Tandon mention that they may select a secretary or so called office bearers to ease their functioning, in most situations they remain informal. They govern themselves on the basis of commonly held norms and values; they manage themselves in the basis of social and interpersonal processes of communication, mutual trust and obligations.

104

The last characteristic of CBO is that CBO is pragmatic and non ideological or un-political which is the opposite of the characteristic of NGO that capable of challenging the ruling ideologies. This characteristic is yet contested. In the Philippines experience found in Constantino (1995), CBO which is aiming at organizing the powerless start with a period called the First Quarter Strom. It is a movement by students protest against the status-quo and articulate visions of a more a desirable future. In other word CBO in Philippines do not necessarily to be non ideological or un-political.

Those characteristics make CBOs as a very effective organization in which community especially poor people in a community can organize them selves in fulfilling their needs by taking up collective action. In this situation usually CBO cooperate with NGO to negotiate with Local Government to address poor people's issues like public services or basic needs.

Theoretical Basis for Collective Action

Collective Action

There have been many discussions about collective action. Three main influential models are being used to analysis the problem of collective action. The very first model is *the tragedy of common* found in Garret Hardin's challenging article in *Science* (1968). His analysis symbolize the environment degradation that will happen when individual using a very scarce resources in common (Elinor Ostrom, 1990). This concept then translated into the second model as *'prisoner's dilemma game'* by Dawes (1973 and 19745). Lastly, Mancur Olson, the very first author who address the *logic of collective action* imply the difficulty of getting individuals to pursue their joint welfare as contrasted to individual welfare (Ostrom 1990, pp.5).

Ostrom (1990), in her book *governing the common: the evolution of institutions for collective action* discuss about self organization and self governance in Common-pool resources (CPRs). This study could be used to explain the emergence of CBOs and whether CBOs do play key role in organizing poor resident. It could be one of the possibilities to answer the inquiry whether or not community member need to organize in an organization and that those organization is truly a representative of the

grass root, common need and common interest of the member. Or could it be that every individual in community simply take individual action to fulfill their interest and their objectives. She examines the general problem facing individuals in CPR situations: how to organize to avoid the adverse outcome of independent action. To solve this problem she used well accepted theories: theory of the firm and theory of the state.

One main purpose of CBOs is organizing its member to take collective action. The other alternative available for communities is to take collective action in a form a social mobilization. Therefore, social mobilization should be viewed as a catalyzing factor which can bring other motivations into play. It can complement latent demand and the other sources of motivations. It is believed that communities via social mobilization (further, combined with self help through CBOs and possibly via outside intervention) can take full or partial responsibility for providing their needs for collective action and the result will be sustainable.

However, individual will get more benefit by joining in organization rather than individual action. There are several conditions under which individual can get together in organization and take up collective action or social movement in order to pursue their interest or goal. According to Olson (1971, pp. 22-33) collective action could also takes place in small groups or we can say in a nut-shell. This kind of activity would occur if the benefit to any one individual exceeded the total project cost. The conditions in which social action or social movement will emerge are when the big challenge of collective action, "free riding", could be eliminated. For this purposes, the size of the group should be minimized into the smallest size (as Olson suggested).

Based on Finding by Shahrukh Rafi Khan (1999), it is relevant that the level of needs could be expected to raise the utility or benefits and at the end would stimulate communities to work together. This means that the needs for individual in community to joint in organization must be high enough as a motivation for every individual to join in collective action, get benefit and stimulate community to coordinate and work together. Another point should be mentioned is the transaction cost that has been reduced in collective activity. Moreover, level of education is contributed to the reduction of this transaction cost. Further, collective action may be likely in a more homogeneous community.

Shahrukh Rafi Khan (1999) identified motivations for collective action; those are: first, social motivation that includes altruism and a sense of well being comes from the social affirmation of performing a community role. Secondly, an individual motivation, to be part of a collective effort, driven by personal and household needs. When this need is backed by the ability and willingness to pay for a certain level of service – quantity and quality – on the part of individuals and communities, one can assert individual or community demand exist

Lastly, to be able to function well (Narayan, 1995) especially in relation to the NGO for taking collective action, community groups must meet these criterias:

1. The group address the felt need and a common interest
2. The benefit of working together outweigh the costs (benefit maybe economic in terms of cash savings, increased production, income, time savings) social capital formation (increased ability to collectively solve problems) , increased individual capacity (knowledge and skills), psychological (sense of belonging, confidence) or political (greater address to authority, greater authority, reduced conflict)
3. The group is embedded in the local social organization
4. The group has the capacity, leadership, knowledge, and skills to manage the tasks.
5. The groups owns and enforces its rules and regulation,

Relationship: the missing link?

The strength of CBOs is that it has an intimate knowledge of their settlements and brings with them the experience of working and dealing with the community members (HABITAT, 1997). As the distinct characteristic, CBO members live in the community and are directly affected by the problems of their settlements. They have ideas of what will work and not. Later on they bring the knowledge of the behavior and attitude of community members.

NGO, on the other hand, brings technical, organizational and managerial experience working with communities. Compare to local government, NGO is more flexible, often they acquired a good insight to

community processes which can help them interpret the priorities of the government to the communities and explain the community priorities to the government. Furthermore, NGO tries to understand things from the community's perspective. The most main obstacle for the NGO is the co-verage area. They do not involve in larger part of the community, and no matter how much the role that the NGO is played; they can not replace government authority/regulatory, powers and greater quantity and range of resources for expanding the coverage area.

It is easier for the people (especially poor resident) who join in CBOs to work with NGO rather than just directly dealing with the local govern-ment in order to get services. The first reason is because in community's perspective, NGO is more responsive, they are not a threat for the com-munity compare to government agencies or government official who has duty to be involved in community which had often operated under earlier policies of slum clearance. NGO understand things better in community's point of view. Further, NGOs and CBOs often feel that government agen-cies can do a lot but are not doing it because they are out to protect their own interests, not the people. On the other hand local government agen-cies feel that NGOs and CBOs do not understand the complexity of the situation government officials are in, and the constraint that prevent them from responding adequately to the needs of urban poor.

However, to some extent, CBOs can not work or cooperate with NGO because of the internal problem within NGOs. Often, most NGOs also work with government. They tend to think that advice and experi-ence not available locally in a sense that ideas and experience from one context useful in another (replicability). This actually brings disadvanta-ge to NGOs. They do not have any legitimacy in representing grass root views and the consequence is that they are more accountable only to their trustees and donors.

Nevertheless, improved relations between civil servants and CBOs increase the effectiveness of local government program/project. The case study in Northeast Brazil proves this hypothesis. Good relationship bet-ween government official and local associations/ CBOs enhanced the ef-fectiveness of municipal programs. When the staff of a Ceara health pro-gram focused on building trust with clients in the communities in which they worked, the quality and impact of the program increased—more

108

families were served and infant mortality declined (Freedheim, 1988; Tendler, 1997)

Case Studies

It is important to note that in New Public Management Perspective, CBO and NGO has greater possibility of being co-opted by the government (local government). The consequence is CBOs and NGOs emphasize more on service delivery issues rather than strengthening their role in advocacy, this is also sometimes create fuzzy accountability whether NGO and CBO should be responsible to Local Government (upward) or to community (downward). CBOs are often being used by government to help it to deliver the services. Why it happens and what is the role of NGO? Can NGO help CBO to remove the co-optation by the government or NGO is also misuse CBO in order to get sustainable funding from the donor and good image from government. Many experiences show this relevance importance.

Local Institutions and Service Delivery in Indonesia

The first case study is based on Grootaert's research on Local Institutions and Service Delivery in Indonesia. This research was done in three part region of Indonesia, those are: Jambi, Jawa Tengah and Nusa Tenggara Timur. This case study investigate community based organization that the Indonesian government has established in national scope to promote its objectives locally and bring together people with the same occupations or concerns (e.g., national association of teachers, national organization of housewives, health and family planning groups).

Since 1979, the government passed the Village Governance Law which put in place a new structure of local government based on neighborhoods (RT/RW) and hamlets (dusun) within villages (Evers, 1998). The key feature of the government-sponsored groups is that they are formally organized and have mandatory membership (Werner, 1998). However, both community-based and government sponsored associations are found across the functional spectrum of associations (social service groups, production and occupational groups, finance and credit groups, etc.).

Below is the table about Local Level Institutions in Indonesia, this local level institution is also called community based organization. The

category is based on Werner (1998), and it consists of 10 local institutions. It comprises every aspect of activities in a community.

Box 1: Types of Local Level Institutions in Indonesia based on Werner 1998

Social Service Groups	Provide assistance and services in education, health, pest management, security, general neighborhood assistance and development; women's group for family welfare (PKK), and its sub-units at the neighborhood level (*Dasawisma*), the integrated health service post (*Posyandu*), the organization for birth-control (*Kelompok* KB) and the primary school pupils' parents organization (BP3).
Production Groups	Founded for the purpose of mutual assistance in the production of goods to facilitate an increased production capacity, e.g. agricultural production, livestock groups, small industry and handicraft groups, the harvest of forest products.
Occupational Groups	Mobilizing the labor force of its members to achieve a common purpose or to solve a common problem are classified as occupational groups
Credit and Saving Groups	Providing credit facilities and informal groups with rotational saving activities (*arisan*)
Religious Groups	Religious activities like collective praying or related to religion like groups for the construction of mosques or churches are classified as religious groups
Natural Resource Management Groups	Target the use and management of natural resources, e.g. irrigation groups, re-greening, social forestry and terracing activities.
Environmental Service Groups	Concerned with mutual help for the maintenance of public facilities (cleaning roads, graveyards, religious facilities and the like).
Governance Groups	Concerned with village governance; Village Development Council (LKMD) and Village Deliberation Council (LMD). The lowest level of administration is the RT (*Rukun Tetangga* = smallest neighborhood unit), followed by RW (*Rukun Warga* = intermediate neighborhood unit), and the *Dusun* (hamlet, largest neighborhood unit). There are no informal governance groups and the existing institutions and structures are the same all over Indonesia
Recreational Groups	Concerned with leisurely pastimes like sports, arts and cultural activities e.g. *Karang Taruna*. (government-initiated group)

Source: Werner (1998)

The following presents 10 most important local associations (read: CBOs) according to community. The most important local associations according to community is the Neighborhood governance which is happen to be government initiated association in the local level as a form of uniformity from the national government. We will find out how the role and the importance of this local association in neighborhood governance in community.

Table 1: The Ten Most Important Local Associations

No	Group Name	Category	Govt. or Community Initiated	Formal or Informal Group	Number of Times Cited (% of Total Citations)
1	RT/RW (neighborhood governance group)	Gov.	G	F	326 (10.9%)
2	Pengajian (Koran recital group)	Religious	C	I	245 (8.2%)
3	IDT (group receiving assistance from government in poor villages)	Finance/Credit	G	F	175 (5.9%)
4	PKK (national organization for Indonesian housewives)	Social Services	G	F	166 (5.6%)
5	Rayon (organization of Protestant church for church maintenance and ministerial support)	Religious	C	F	122 (4.1%)
6	Kelompok Tani (association of farmers)	Production	G/C	F/I	120 (4.0%)
7	Arisan Dusun (hamlet or neighborhood based rotating savings group)	Finance/Credit	C	I	114 (3.8%)
8	Kelompok Doa (Catholic prayer group)	Religious	C	F	95 (3.2%)
9	Posyandu (government sponsored group to promote health of children and pregnant/ feeding mothers)	Social Services	G	F	93 (3.1%)
10	Lembaga Adat (traditional group to regulate customs, settle disputes and impose sanctions)	Social Services	C	F	87 (2.9%)

Sources: Christiaan Grootaert, Local Institutions and Service Delivery in Indonesia, table 14 p. 39 (1997)

Table 2 shows the percentage of involvement in service provision in the most important local associations. There are several important activity related to service provision in community, range from education to land, forestry and water rights. The result shows that in general education service is the biggest percentage.

Table 2: Involvement in Service Provision of the Most Important Groups

% of Memberships in Groups Active In	Jambi	Jawa Tengah	Nusa Tenggara Timur	All
Education	62.2	43.1	19.6	40.2
Health	6.9	12.2	5.1	7.9
Water Supply and Sanitation	0.0	6.5	4.5	3.8
Electricity	0.0	0.8	0.1	0.3
Credit	13.6	56.2	15.7	27.9
Savings	21.3	53.4	9.6	27.1
Agricultural Inputs/Technology	4.8	9.2	7.4	7.2
Irrigation	2.0	2.0	3.2	2.4
Land, Forestry, Water Rights	7.6	2.7	4.6	4.9

Sources: Christiaan Grootaert, Local Institutions and Service Delivery in Indonesia, table 18 p. 46 (1997)

The conclusion of this research is that household in Indonesia do not primarily join local associations to improve their access to particular services. But the main function of local groups seems to be in the area of practicing religion and the dissemination of certain government functions at the local level. Nevertheless, important point should be noted here, many associations also have multiple functions but the Local Level Institution (LLI) Study's questionnaires recorded only the primary objective of each association. For example, many religious groups are active in the provision of credit or education (Werner, 1998). The possibility exists, therefore, that respondents' answers about associations' primary role in the provision of services may underestimate the role of associations in this area. The exceptions are education in Jambi and Jawa Tengah and access to credit in Jawa Tengah. In those cases, a majority of associations considered by households as most important are active in the provision of those services. But when it comes to other services—health, water supply and sanitation, electricity, irrigation, agricultural technology or land/forestry/water rights—fewer than 8% of important memberships are in associations dealing with these issues.

The pin point of this case study is that for a large part of people in community it is an obligatory to join in community organization because of the imposition of uniform structure by the national level. There are no such individual motivations to join in. Consequently, this brings impact for CBOs. CBOs then are means of dissemination at the local level of government function. In this sense, Community Based Organizations play its key role in helping community to get access to public services, but in this case study, the role of organizing public services from local government is done without any intervention from NGO (local/international). It is also important to note here that under the condition of being the means of dissemination, then this type CBOs are well recognized in the formal system of public service provision.

Role of Community Based Organization in Forest Management

Indonesia has been applying Community Forestry Program (Hutan Kemasyarakatan) for more than a decade. This program tries to accommodate two issues: decentralization of forest management while at the same time build the capacity of community organization through insurance of community participation.

Case study presented by Suryadi (2001) discusses the implementation of this program in Nusa Tenggara Barat in Lombok Island, Indonesia. Nusa Tenggara Barat, in the past, like in any other area in Indonesia, has its own community organization that holds the full responsibility in forest management. It is mentioned by Werner (1998) that Indonesia has a long tradition of community-based groups (swadaya), which are mostly informally organized. The community leaders called Pemangku[2] and Perumbak[3] formulate laws for using and conserving the forest. Unfortunately this community based organization is broken down and replaced by uniform social and cultural model for community life (in purpose to maintain the unitary state, the government restricted political activity through de-politician and the control of community organizations). This issue is also happen in other country such Uzbekistan in which there is

---

[2] Pemangku is a traditional forest guard with responsibility for enforcing the customary law
[3] Perumbak are people who live in the forest and are responsible for protecting animals from hunters

113

restriction of the existing of community based organization and ritual organization.

The implementation of this uniform model of community organization is not only applied in forest management but also in irrigation system and any other form of traditional organization. For example: *subak* system for irrigation management was replaced by P3A (water user farmer association) and the authority of *nagari* system (traditional village governance) was vested in the *Kepala Desa* or *Kelurahan* (head village officer).

This uniform social organization was being used by the government to occupy the resources. Many conflicts then emerge due to this uniform organization and uneven distribution of benefit from the usage of resources and land or forest. There were also denial of community rights on land and forest. Community Forest Program tries to address those problems by increasing community participation. In advocacy group's perspective, community forest program initiated by government is different from people's forest management system in terms of rights and access regulation and in terms of the management process, including the method of forest use and type of community organization set up.

Before proposing the community forestry program, in an effort to develop their power, the nine farmer groups formed *Kelompok Mitra Pengaman Hutan* (partnership for forest security) or KMPH. The main reason for developing the institution was because farmers had been unable to stop illegal logging without formal organization. LP3ES[4] facilitate this initiation which was claimed as a successful initiative).

KMPH actually has been well defined community based organization that has developed organizational structure. It has created regulations to define rights and obligation for each member. Then eventually this CBO approved by the government to be responsible for implementing the program.

KMPH is a community based organization without formal and legal legitimacy to impose sanction and punishment. Therefore, in many cases when KMPH did patrol in particular occasion when they catch KMPH members, non members, and even police officials violating land use code. They merely gathered evidence and reported forest violence to the forest

---

[4] LP3Es is an NGO in Nusa Tenggara Barat that has actively assisted farmers at Sesaot village in efforts to manage the protected forest since 1993.

or local police officials. Later on the government granted KMPH the authority to try cases involving their members, while cases involving non members and outsiders were turned out to be over to Forum Komunikasi Pengaman Hutan (FKPH) or communication Forum for Forest Protection. With this new authority within one year (1995-1996) KMPH resolved 16 cases related to disturbing community forestry trial and poaching of timber from protected forest area. And During the community court meeting in 1995, KMPh imposed social sanctions on four individual farmers who had been poaching timber. On the other hand, punishment from the local police, especially for outside violators was not viewed as being serious. Following every meeting of the FKPH to discuss forest violations, the board of KMPH became frustrated with the police because the violators remain free. KMPH often criticized law enforcement and openly opposed with the government both in formal meeting and local newspaper.

Lately, KMPH is recognized as Partnership Group for forest protection is a pioneer community organization created by the community itself for forest management. Nowadays, KMPH has a membership of 152 farmers and more than 1500 farmers as target group or participants in five separate villages. And as a CBO KMPH, also manage to diversify its activity. It now has small business activities both to serve the members and participants and to generate income for KMPH. They now occupy three types of business involving low income housing, savings and credit and income generating activities. In 1999, KMPH had Rp. 40 million (US$ 3000) worth of assets generated from membership fees, profit from business and contribution from visitors and other parties. In legal terms, KMPH now is a formal organization accorded legal status by the state court.

Based on this case study we understand that this community organization was set up by the people in community because of the need to be able to stop illegal logging and for this purpose community need without formal organization. It is necessary for community based organization to have legal and formal recognition within the formal system so that in return CBO also have legal and formal legitimacy to impose sanction to the free rider or member and people outside membership that try to break rule and creating problem and bring negative impact for the whole people within those locality. This type of recognition in legal and formal system especially needed in managing natural resources in which the role of CBOs still significant.

115

Kampung Improvement Program, urban social movement

This project was done in much more top-down planning.In the implementation of this project, The Institute of Technology Surabaya (ITS) act as the broker. One of its roles is liaising between people and the government. This role has been achieved by working with non governmental organizations and helping the kampong representatives to identify and prioritize their problems, monitor progress and incorporate the learning into the future KIP processes. ITS also provides information, advice and consultancy to interested parties and the public. The NGO that work with this university is YAYASAN PERMUKIMAN KITA, which acts as a coordinator or mediator between government and the community. They organize meeting and visiting the neighborhood to understand community problems and their potential resources they have. They help people to make proposal and decisions in relation to governments plan. They assist the community in supervising project implementation and maintaining the project result. In this case, the role of NGO partnership to promote the program is important. Therefore, good working links between government and other organizations are required.

Later on this is become the trademark of Surabaya city: involvement of the community in every stage of the project; from the design, construction and maintenance of the project. Community approval is important for all over the stages. Various meetings are held to promote discussion between the community and the responsible government agency. The community is asked to adjust draft plans to suit their needs. Involvement in the project planning process ensures community ownership of the project and greater success in its implementation. The community plays active role in keeping footpaths and drains clean, arranging minor repair and ensuring garbage is kept in proper receptacles.

Apart from the community involvement, this project also encouraged women participation. It is believed that women play special role in social and environmental management within their communities. Community cohesiveness is usually based on women's activity. For this purpose Women's welfare Organisation (PKK) take part in the planning, implementation and maintenance of projects, give ideas and active involvement in major decision making. As the impact of this community

116

involvement, the existing community organizations within the Kampung have been strengthened and their capacity built up.

It is clearer now that there is practically no way that low-income, already socially ostracized individuals – no matter how highly motivated – can single handedly mobilize resources and force local government to provide better services for this poor resident. So the only option left for them is that for resident of low income areas rural as well as urban community development corporations (CDCs) and other CBOs can and sometimes do attempt to fill the role of collective agent for individual job seekers.

Conclusion

Community based organization in any way still important to help all of people in the community to be more actively participate and get benefit from the involvement, apart from the status of the membership, whether mandatory or voluntary. Although there are some possibility of being co-opt by the government, as long as the co-optation has positive impacts on service provision from the government then it is still acceptable. However, one of the characteristic of CBOs is being pragmatic and non-ideological (un-political), it does not necessarily follow one particular ideological and easily being co-opted. Further, CBOs are legitimate grass root organization in which all of people' interest be represented. It is not supposed to lose its power and bargaining position against non-performance local government

Whether or not CBOs need to consolidate with NGO to deal with the local government is really contextual. From the case studies we found out that if CBOs are means of local government in a sense that it is created by government then it is possible to leave out the role of NGO. Because this type of CBO has already being recognize is the legal and formal system. The second case study about forest management shows us that it is important for CBOs to have legal and formal recognition from the government. Recognition in formal system is urgent if the environment in which CBOs operate has great possibility of free rider or non performance, and also vulnerable for conflict.

117

Reference:

B. Harrison & M. Weiss. (1998). *Workforce Development Networks: Community Based Organizations and Regional Alliances.* London: Sage Publications.

Berner, Erhard. (1997). Defending A place in the city: Localities and the struggle for urban land in Metro Manila. Manila: Ateneo de Manila University Press

Christiaan Grootaert. (1999). *Local Institutions and Service Delivery in Indonesia.* The World Bank.

Constantino-David, K. (1995). Community organizing in Philippines: The Experience of Development NGOs. In : M. Mayo & G. Craig (eds) Community Empowerment: A reader in Participation and Development. London: Zed.

Ostrom, Elinor. (1990). *Governing the Common: the evolution of institutions for collective action.* Cambridge University Press.

Shahrukh Rafi Khan. (1999). Government, Communities and Non Governmental Organizations in Social Sector Delivery : Collective Action in Rural Drinking Water Supply, Ashgate.

Thomas, A. (1992), *Non governmental organizations and the limits to empowerment. In: M. Wuyts, M. Mackintosh & T. Hewitt (eds) Development policy and public action.* Oxford: Oxford University Press

Journal and Workshop

Understanding Community Organizations" Participation & Governance, Vol.4 No.10 July 1997.p.13

United Centre for Human Settlement (HABITAT) & Community Development Program for Asia and CITYNET regional Network of Local Authorities for the Management of Human Settlements. (1997). Partnership for Local Action: A sourcebook on Participatory Approaches to Shelter and Human Settlements Improvement for Local Government Officials.

Participation & Governance bulletin "Understanding Community Organizations", Vol.4 No.10 July 1997.p.13

Narayan, Deepa (1995) Designing Community-Based Development. Participation Series, Environment Department Paper No. 7, World Bank, Washington, D.C. in "Understanding Community Organizations" Participation & Governance, Vol.4 No.10 July 1997.p.13)

K. Suryanata., G. Dolcemascolo., R. Fisher., J. Fox. (2001). Enabling Policy Frameworks for Successful Community Based Resources Management: Proceeding from the Ninth Workshop on Forestlands, East-West Center and Regional Community Forestry Training Center.

Suryadi (2001), "Enabling Policy Frameworks for Successful Community Based Resources Management: Proceeding from the Ninth workshop on Community-Based Resources Management of Forestlands (2001)"

119