

PARTICIPATORY ACTION RESEARCH AND ITS APPLICATION IN DISTRICT GOVERNMENT SETTINGS¹

Heru Komarudinⁱ, Adnan Hasantohaⁱⁱ, Ngakan Putu Okaⁱⁱⁱ, Syamsuddin^{iv} and Deddy Irawan^v

Abstract

The paper explores the application of Participatory Action Research (PAR) approach in district government settings and draws lessons from research conducted in several districts in Indonesia during the decentralization transition period. The research projects have been engaged in policy processes at the district level. This has been to identify, analyze and develop shared policy recommendations on how decentralized forestry and spatial planning policies affect local livelihoods and promote collective action, in securing property rights for the poor.

While the efficacy of PAR in empowering local communities has been widely recognized, this paper explores the potential use of the approach in instigating a learning process among government officials. This may be of particular assistance when officials are attempting to better understand district issues and interacting with local people, in order to bring about changes.

Our findings indicate that the approach serves as a suitable tool to generate greater research impacts than do extractive methods. When using PAR, government people are more motivated to learn about their problems and reflect on the actions they have taken. The PAR approach also allows the research to better understand how elite capture takes place in policy processes that further disadvantage the poor and marginalized groups. Factors that determined the prospective use of this approach, as well as challenges to the application at the district level, are discussed.

Introduction

After the fall of the New Order government, Indonesia introduced what many considered a radical and very rapid process of decentralization in 1999. Decentralization in the forestry sector is not an exception. The country's experiences with decentralization policies in forestry offer a unique opportunity for stakeholders to reflect on what has happened with the interaction between: central and district governments; and between government officials and the private sector and the public, including NGOs and local communities. As shown in another paper (see Dermawan et al 2006), the implementation of decentralization in the forestry sector in Indonesia has swung like a pendulum between decentralized and highly centralized control.

Since the introduction of decentralization, there has been a change in development planning from a top-down to a combined top-down and bottom-up process. There has also been an increase in public demand for greater governance transparency and accountability. These

¹ To be presented at the Eleventh Biennial Global Conference of the International Association for the Study of Common Property (IASCP) with the theme "Survival of the Commons: Mounting Challenges & New Realities", 19-23 June, 2006, Bali, Indonesia

have brought about changes in the way government institutions interact with other actors and deal with issues, which were previously considered too sensitive.

In our district sites, thanks to intensive consultation with NGOs, research centers and universities, people have seen an improved understanding among the authorities for the need to take account of stakeholder inputs when a policy is being formulated, such as in the cases of spatial planning and land allocation processes and that of development planning. The district as well as central government officials have become less rigid and more willing to deliberate a middle way of dealing with such contested and sensitive issues as property rights and land tenure. Furthermore, decentralization has created opportunities for the local communities and the public to act collectively in order to participate in the policy processes through open public commentary on state governance issues.

All of the above changes pertaining to decentralization have provided lessons for all, created avenues for shared learning and fostered collaboration among the stakeholders involved. These have been facilitated by three CIFOR research projects, which we refer to in this paper. Not only have these projects produced analytical data, but also valuable lessons learned providing different parties with a better collaborative tool. The paper also looks at the application of PAR and specifically identifies what has worked and not worked in making it an effective means for learning among district government officials.

In this paper, we do not refer to the settings where district government officials use the approach to change their organizational behavior. Instead, we refer to the situation where they interact with local people and other stakeholders as part of our research.

Participatory Action Research: defined

Many research practitioners advocate participatory action research as a methodological approach that can counter both epistemic and elite capture - by more powerful and influential stakeholders in policy processes - that can further disadvantage poor and marginalized groups (See for example: Fairhead and Leach, 2003; Chambers, 1997). IISD² stated that “PAR is a more activist approach, working to empower the local community or its representatives, to manipulate the higher level power structures. PAR works directly with local political or development capacities to bring real, visible organizational structures, effective local advocacy, and a durable change in power relations with the center. If it can avoid the danger of entrenching self-interested local elite, and address honestly the long-term choices that must be made on resource utilization, it perhaps has the most potential of all the methods described to secure the resources for sustainable livelihoods”.

Greenwood and Levin (1998) described action research as social research carried out by a team encompassing professional action researchers and members of organizations or community seeking to improve their situation. Together, the professional researcher and the stakeholders define the problem to be examined, co generate relevant knowledge about them, learn and execute social research techniques, take action and interpret the results of actions based on what they have learned. The research aims to increase the ability of the involved

² Through its website “Participatory research for sustainable livelihoods: a guide for field projects on adaptive strategies”, available at <http://www.iisd.org/casl/CASLGuide/PAR.htm>

community or organization members to control their own destinies more effectively and to keep improving their capacity to do so.

O'Brien (1997) simply considered action research as "learning by doing" where a group of people identifies a problem, does something to resolve it, sees how successful their efforts were, and, if not satisfied, tries again. He went on to provide a more succinct definition by saying that action research aims to contribute both to the practical concerns of people in an immediate problematic situation and to further the goals of social science simultaneously".

There are countless tiny cycles of participatory reflection on action, learning about action and then new informed action which is in turn the subject of further reflection. Every minute of every hour may see participants absorbing new ways of seeing or thinking in the light of their experience, leading to new related actions being taken on the spot. Often these will pass unnoticed and unrecorded, but with practice these too become the subject of further reflection and group self-understanding. Change does not happen at 'the end' - it happens throughout (Wadsworth, 1998; McTaggart, 1989).

Action research refers to the conjunction of three elements, research, action and participation. Wadsworth (1998) stated that in its most developed state these differences begin to dissolve in practice. Greenwood and Levin (1998) firmly stated that a research cannot be called an action research if any of the three elements is absent. PAR has certain attributes that characterize it and separate action research from other types of research. The core characteristics of action research and participatory action research include (Greenwood and Levin, 1998; Hagey, 1997):

- it is context bound and addresses real-life problems, which originate within the communities or workplace itself;
- the research goal is to fundamentally improve the lives of those involved through structural transformation
- it is inquiry where participants and researchers co generate knowledge through collaborative communicative processes in which all participants' contributions are taken seriously, and
- it treats the diversity of experience and capacities within the local group as an opportunity for the enrichment of the research action process

As described by Huizer (1997), participatory action-research has been carried out over the last few decades in several countries, and was mostly related to such fields as community- and peasant organizations, adult education, and similar grassroot oriented development efforts, designed to lead to "the empowerment of the poor".

Three Cases

This section outlines the three research projects, which used the PAR approach and engaged government officials in varying degrees of involvement in the research processes from planning, implementation, reflection to re-planning phases. The extent to which the approach has been used depended not only on the methodological designs put forward in the respective proposal, but also on the researchers' varying abilities to comprehend the concept of action research and put it into practice.

The first and second case studies characterize the extensive application of action research aimed to empower local communities in order to improve their access to resources, information and to strengthen their position vis a vis other stakeholders in policy development processes. Both cases brought government officials into repeated interaction with the communities, during which information and learning were shared. In the third case, the research project started its first cycle at the district level. This allowed the government officials to analyze their own problems and to see the likely impacts of forestry policies on community livelihoods. The project then facilitated the government officials' involvement with the local people and in so doing assisted the latter's interaction with government institutions.

Case study 1: Adaptive Collaborative Management

This is the Jambi/Indonesian case of CIFOR's multi-country research project called "Local People, Devolution and Adaptive Collaborative Management of Forests (ACM)". "The goal of ACM is to enhance forest management decision making at the local level, and explore the potential role of collaboration and social learning in forest management, including the role of criteria and indicators as a tool within the process" (McDougall, 2003). The project, which is still underway and nearing completion, has been using PAR as an approach since 2001. Through this approach, diverse local people and other relevant stakeholders, including district government officials, have been involved in the process and jointly developed a set of agreed and easily understood criteria and indicators for equitable and sustainable management of their forest resources. The approach provided stakeholder groups with an opportunity to collectively analyze the issues, reflect on what has happened and to interact with each other in a way that has generated important lessons.

Since April 2003, the project has started its second phase and continued to work in one village in Jambi Province, Baru Pelepat Village. With the theme "Building Collaboration and Shared Learning for Equitable and Sustainable Forest Management around Kerinci Seblat National Park", the project focused on the role of collaboration among the stakeholders as a means to improve equity, expand and improve livelihood options and to sustain their forest resources. Through the research cycle, the project engaged government officials from the District Forestry Office, District Development Planning Agency (Bappeda), District Environmental Controlling Office and District Legal Office in activities such as village spatial planning, strengthening of the village boundaries and scaling up the mutually agreed village structure plan to district spatial planning; and preparing an academic draft of traditional community laws.

In an effort to gain recognition of traditional and protection forests from district as well as provincial governments, for example, the project's stakeholders went through the learning cycle. During a planning phase, stakeholders for instance agreed to have a policy dialogue on traditional forests, which was then conducted during the action phase. In the reflection phase, they then reflected on the need to put forward rules for the management and utilization of traditional forests in a district regulation, and to commission a team to prepare the draft. The team was comprised of representatives from villagers, the District Forestry and Estate Crops Office, District Development Planning Agency, District Legal Office and ACM members.

During the action phase, a team was established and initial work was made to collect necessary information and data and to schedule for a public consultation. They agreed that

the District Forestry and Estate Crops Office should lead the process while ACM and the local villagers collect supporting information. During the next planning phase, a working meeting was proposed to be held and attended by all team members to analyze the compiled information. During the action phase, the team discussed substantial issues related to how traditional forests could be recognized and what strategies might be devised for obtaining policy support. It was also agreed during this phase to have the forest legalized through a provincial-level regulation.

Case study 2: Collective Action to Secure Property Rights for the Poor

Supported by CGIAR System-wide Programme on Collective Action and Property Rights (CAPRI), our research has been focusing on understanding the current access to property rights that benefit the poor in two districts in Jambi Province, Indonesia. We are also interested in learning how local communities, government officials and other stakeholders interact among themselves in the formation of a property right regime. Within the scope of our study, we have also been trying to discover who benefits the most from the current system and how this affects local community members' share of natural resource benefits. How can collective action enhance local people's access to influential decision-making networks, so that policy outcomes reflect their long-term development interests and elite capture is reduced?

The project started with an Inception Workshop in September 2004 and training on participatory action research. The workshop aimed to better understand the basic concepts of collective action and property rights, and how they are linked to poverty reduction. The workshop participants, including government officials, agreed to follow-up actions to address local issues that were relevant to the research framework and to the regional governments. During the training program, government officials, some of whom later became our research partners, were trained in the use of PAR for the first time. They found the training interesting and, as claimed by some, PAR encouraged them to acknowledge social problems and to interact with people differently, quite a different mechanism from what they were used to.

A collaboration was then established between CIFOR and the two Bappedas. Instead of creating an advisory board, the research engaged two people from Bappeda and one from District Forestry Office in each district site as PAR researchers. A formal contract outlining tasks and responsibilities was made between CIFOR and the two Bappedas. The government researchers analyzed macro and district-related issues facing the district government. They also interacted with other stakeholders in various avenues for learning such as workshops, focus group discussions, informal discussions and other shared learning activities. In Bungo district, the sequence of interaction has been facilitated by a number of NGOs and research centers, including CIFOR.

In the context of CAPRI research, government researchers identified a number of government policies that are considered to affect collective action by local communities and to secure property rights. The policies currently being studied include:

- The district's attempts to empower forest dependent people by providing community groups with revolving funds. A program, called BUP (*Bantuan Usaha Produktif*) or productive business aid, was intended to stimulate community groups to improve their livelihood options. Through this program, government officials, among others, learned

about how they can disburse funds effectively to reach their target group/s, and how important it is to give the funds to self-motivated groups.

- The Ministry of Forestry's policies to speed up the gazetment of forest area boundaries across the country, through what they call 'a forest area boundary re-construction program'. Despite the program's intentions, which seemed to make property rights clear to all parties, the program turned out to leave no room for local communities to negotiate once an overlap is found between the state-owned forest areas and local community lands. The program was merely designed to return boundary poles to their original locations and not to enter into negotiation nor discussion with local people, who live nearby.
- The government's development planning forums, locally referred to as Musrenbang (*Musyawah Perencanaan Pembangunan*), conducted in stages at village, sub-district and district levels. Villagers collectively agreed on the proposed development programs for their village. Their representatives then took their proposals to the sub-district forum. District officials act as observers in the forums conducted at the lower levels, in order to learn about local people's aspirations and how local voices are represented.
- The district's spatial planning and land allocation processes. The government researchers have been looking at the mechanisms through which the district's spatial plan has been prepared and deliberated among the stakeholders. They have also been examining ways of strengthening property rights for the poor through spatial planning processes. Through a series of discussions, they reflected on issues that limit the value of the spatial plan as a useful reference for regional development, and on other issues regarding the proposed conversion from state-owned forests (*kawasan hutan*) to non-forestry areas. They agreed to present the issue to the Ministry of Forestry which has the sole authority to approve the proposal.

Though it is still in the early stage of action research, the project's experiences with the approach have shown positive changes in the government officials' attitudes towards the involvement of outsiders. In Bungo district, there has been a good response from Bappeda which is now taking into consideration stakeholder inputs in the development of the district's mid-term development plan (*Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah*). The district government has recently incorporated suggested policies, made by a group of NGOs, into the district's revised spatial plan.. These policies were related to the need for a linkage between upstream and downstream areas in the watershed system.

Case study 3: Can Decentralization Work for Forests and the Poor?

The research project comprised two phases. The first round of research was conducted over an eighteen month period between 2003 and 2004, in five provinces across Indonesia (East and West Kalimantan, Jambi, Papua and South Sulawesi). Supported by ACIAR and DfID, the research project documented impacts of decentralization on sustainable forest management, equitable regional development and local livelihoods. The second phase of the research was started in late 2005 and is currently underway in only one district in South Sulawesi. The research project continued to examine the impacts of decentralization following the issuance of a new regional governance law^{vi} and to explore implications for the forestry sector. In particular, the current research has been looking at how decisions are being made to address issues pertaining to forest authority, shared between central and regional governments, spatial planning and forestry benefit distribution, in order to create incentive and disincentive systems for forest management.

The project was collaboratively conducted between CIFOR and researchers from three universities and NGOs who have diverse backgrounds and qualifications such as forestry, agricultural economics, law, politics and ecology. At the beginning of the first phase of the research, a Local Advisory Group was established in each district site. The group, comprising people from relevant government institutions and from traditional communities, have provided advice on the research substance and ensured the policy uptake of research findings.

A case study approach was used by the project to describe why and how policy decisions regarding forestry decentralization were made and implemented, and to produce analytical information on forest resources. A policy action research approach, in addition, was also introduced to researchers to facilitate the dynamic process of interactions between stakeholders and to help them pursue the follow-up actions. A series of group discussions, informal meetings and workshops were made to serve as a forum where local stakeholders, particularly local people and the private sector, interact with government officials.

Since action research was new to most of the research team's members, there have been additional challenges in using this approach as described below. The project research adopted only the essence of the approach and did not apply it completely. As a result, learning did not flow in a structured way through the cycle of planning, action and reflection. There were no agreed indicators for achievement and collaborative monitoring was not developed to sustain the cycle. However, the research project took account of participatory principles when data were collected, triangulated and analyzed, and when recommendations for reform were developed. Despite its central role in directing the research, the project researchers acted more as a facilitatory function to enable the relevant stakeholders to reflect on major issues, analyze the collected information and seek common solutions. Participatory rural appraisal techniques, for example, were used to collect information on household income, land use and forest-dependency in the district sites.

The research project has produced lessons and impacts on a number of areas. For example, in Tanjung Jabung Barat, one of the project district sites, there was increased awareness among the local stakeholders of the importance of public participation in district policymaking processes. One of the agreed follow-up actions was to ask the public to take part in reviewing a draft on forest product taxation (Sudirman et al 2005). In the other three sites in Bulungan, Sintang and Manokwari districts, researchers and local stakeholders together analyzed the impacts of decentralized forest policies on local people's access to policy processes and to forest resources. We found that despite the major intention of the policy, the decentralization in forestry has failed to reach its intended goals and encouraged rent-seeking behavior to continue to dominate the benefits, instead (Samsu et al, 2005; Yasmi et al, 2005 and Tokede et al, 2005).

In Luwu Utara, South Sulawesi, thanks to repeated interaction between the researchers and government officials, the district government acknowledged the significant role of the project in helping them to better understand their problems related to forest resources. The District Forestry Office regards the research report as an important reference for their programs, some of which have been approved by the Local Parliament. Through the learning process, the officials have now adopted a more inclusive manner in the development of forest plans and slightly changed the way they view traditional forests (*hutan adat*). Local communities who have been previously excluded in the policy process now have a chance to express their aspiration freely. They are now receiving up-to-date information concerning government programs and regulations. They have also a better sense of the complexities of the

government officials' work and become less demanding when making claims, e.g. in the cases of land disputes and timber utilization rights in two village sites.

Decentralized Local Government Lessons: Some Paths to Learning

In 1999, the government issued a law, No. 22/1999 on Regional Governance, which granted greater autonomy to the regional government across the country for managing and controlling their administrative affairs and resources. During this decentralization era, the way decisions are made have changed from that of the New Order government. District heads together with the Local Parliaments are at liberty to formulate and implement their own policies. There are now some avenues available to the public to take part in policy processes. Members of Local Parliaments can now strengthen their positions vis a vis the executives in order to ensure public input to regional development.

Decentralization in forest resource management, especially during the period from 1999 to 2004, brought about many lessons. Before 1999, timber concession licenses were completely controlled by central government. They were subsequently handed over to the district governments as part of the decentralization process. Concerns over the degradation of forest resources and disagreements between central and district governments finally led to the Minister of Forestry issuing a decree suspending the district government's authority to issue small-scale timber extraction licenses. A government regulation subsequently revoked the district heads' authority.

Coinciding with decentralization, reforms took place in various segments of development and governance. One reform, which relates to regional development, has applied a performance-based system, making every government unit accountable to its supervisory management, local parliaments and to the public at large. Local officials are now more vigilant when they propose a program for approval by the district parliament and when they spend money for approved programs. The new system^{vii} encourages local governments to look to future visions and goals, to set up valid and reliable sets of indicators, and to compare and reflect on what has happened in previous years. Performance indicators are grouped into input, output, outcome, benefit and impact, and should be specific and clear, measurable, objective and adaptive to changes. The system also allows local government institutions to be evaluated and to evaluate the processes they have gone through in achieving their intended goals.

Another law, issued in 2004^{viii}, and its implementing rules that stipulate the national system for development planning have improved the mechanisms through which local aspiration are accommodated. Instead of a merely top-down approach, these new laws promote the use of a more participatory and combined approach of top-down^{ix} and bottom-up^x and ensure that local aspiration pass through forums conducted at village, sub-district and district levels.

Bappedda, one of the district government institutions tasked with planning and coordinating inputs for district development, has basically a cycle of evaluation, planning, action and reflection. An evaluation is made to check the previous year's implementation of programmes and to see what has worked and not worked, and to bring this input to the next phase of planning. A development activity is planned during meetings and forums at both village and district levels.

Factors that promote and limit the effective use of PAR and learning

Our experience has shown that the government officials, who joined the training programs on PAR, at the initial stage of the three research projects, now have a better understanding of the basic concepts of the approach. Constant attempts to get government officials involved in the various stages of research through inception workshops, data sharing, shared learning, joint analysis of and interactive discussions on crucial issues have been instrumental in maintaining the learning process among the officials.

However, there are some issues that limit the effective use of this approach. The most critical one in getting government officials involved in the action research process pertains to power relations. When they come into contact with other stakeholders, it is not easy for them to sit together and share the power with others. Despite the widely increased opportunities for people to interact in an open and transparent way, as offered by the decentralization scheme, government officials were inclined to act as supervisors rather than partners. When they interact with local communities, they are used to “an extension worker and consultative” way of acting - a one-way communication style.

Already entrenched bureaucratic systems and attitudes have prevented officials from changing their behavior. This is not unusual, since as Milward (1994) stated, theories of bureaucracy begin with the assumption that public organizations are boundary-maintaining entities. Red tape, rigidity and rule-mindedness are all by-products of the attempt by leaders to control the behavior of subordinates in the organization.

As Hagey (1998) said, PAR requires political analysis and shared understanding of the authority and power relations of all parties involved, be they individuals or bureaucratic offices. Aimers (2000) asserted that appropriate communication styles and a willingness to share power are vital in the PAR process. Stringer (1997) warned that researchers must also guard against the acting out of power struggles, which withhold information or block the release of resources.

Many opponents claim that the PAR approach takes too long before community impacts can be seen and recorded. On the other hand, the mechanism within the bureaucracy through which pro-poor governmental programs are implemented is overly strict. Programs already approved for implementation for a certain year and conducted in the first months of that year should be finished by the end of the associated fiscal year, without taking into account whether the program has been effectively and efficiently implemented.

Government programs that are designed for multi-year periods may be an exception. Once the budget becomes available, there is a strong tendency among government institutions to rush to finish a program before the closing of the fiscal year. There is still a general belief that there is a higher likelihood of next year's proposals for development programs being accepted if the previous allocation of funds is finished, regardless of the quality. This corresponds to what Stringer (1996:19-20) warned about the public agencies' intention "to get the job done", which has implications for a lack of community control over decision making.

Government attempts to adopt participatory action research has also been confronted by not only a limited budget, but also a lack of awareness among the policymakers of the need to consider allocating budget resources to the support of participatory policymaking as a

priority. Despite the clear mandate given by various laws^{xi}, requiring the need for the involvement of as many stakeholder views as possible in policymaking, we often found instances where decision makers, and the district government administrative systems, were not fully supportive.

In action research, insiders and outsiders join in a mutual learning process. The enabling mechanism for this is communication. New understandings are created through discourses between people engaged in the inquiry (Greenwood and Levin 1998). Government officials were often found to be comfortable when speaking on behalf of their organization rather than speaking for themselves. Once they follow through the learning cycle, such a situation often hampers the learning process, in particular an action phase, when they would have to take action beyond the capacity of either the members or the institution. The limited authority devolved by the central government, as in the case of forest resource management, made it more difficult for the district government to respond appropriately to community needs as a result of the PAR research processes.

Yearly district government programs and projects commonly receive funds from the district budget, deliberated by the district head and members of the Local Parliament (DPRD). Once the budget has been approved and becomes available, programs or projects are then implemented. The budget for set programs is strict and less adaptive to changes. As a result of deliberations, the Budget Committee actually reserves some of the budget (locally known as 'saving') intended for contingency purposes. This should have become an opportunity for the district government to be more accommodating to arising needs. However, the budget has often been used by the elite seeking economic rents at the expense of the poor and disadvantaged.

Information plays a crucial role for people to effectively learn from an inquiry process. Many policies which will likely have profound impacts on people's livelihoods are deliberated internally within the government structure, and the government officers are often reluctant to disclose what they perceive as confidential information to the public, or even to the research partners with whom they collaborate. For example, a company was granted a license for land in Jambi, information for which local government officials refused to disclose. It is believed that the company was owned or partly owned by an official.

Another factor that can hamper the learning process, in the government structure, concerns the district's political processes. One of the country's new regulations stipulates that the head of a district be directly elected (locally known as *Pemilihan Kepala Daerah Secara Langsung* or PILKADA), and no longer elected by the local parliament. As in all of our district sites, government officials, with whom we have been collaborating, have voted for different candidates. This has created competition and rivalry, which is not conducive to learning. During the process or once the new district head takes up his office, there are often many subsequent changes in the agenda, personnel etc. These changes unfortunately result in the breaking of the continuity of the lessons learned, as the officials involved in the research are often replaced. It is then back to square one.

Lessons learned

When starting an action research, establishing a contract agreement with government institutions may be useful. This would help to ensure endorsement from the district head and

active participation of the government officials. Through this agreement, a clear set of tasks and responsibilities will help those assigned to get involved and to better understand the processes. The agreement will assist in retaining individuals throughout the research process.

A professional researcher who is skilled in action research and participatory techniques may be required to help government officials maintain their learning process through PAR. Constant support is required to ensure that what has been agreed in one forum can be followed up in the later stages of action and reflection. This will further enhance the capacity of government officials to learn and subsequently make policy changes and reforms. Multi-stakeholder meetings or discussions, even informal, which are routinely conducted, will improve relations between government officials and other actors.

Decentralization in terms of the transferred authority to the district and the improved capacity of local people to have their say, have led to greater potential for improving communication and interactions between officials with power, to make decisions, and the communities with whom they interact through the PAR process. However, challenges seem to remain. An imbalance of power, rigid institutional systems and ingrained habits of bureaucrats to resist radical changes and the disclosure of specific information to others, are among the major issues which will continue to hamper the effective use of the PAR approach and meaningful interaction between officials and other stakeholders.

References

- Aimers, J. (2000). Using participatory action research in a local government setting. *Action Research E-Reports*, 11. Available at: <http://pandora.nla.gov.au/parchive/2001/Z2001-Mar-13/www.cchs.usyd.edu.au/arow/arer/011.htm>
- Dermawan, A., Komarudin, H. and McGrath S. 2006. Decentralization in Indonesia's forestry sector: Is it over? What comes next?. Paper presented at the Eleventh Biennial Global Conference of The International Association for the Study of Common Property (IASCP) on the theme 'Survival of the Commons: Mounting Challenges and New Realities', Bali, 19–23 June, 2006.
- Greenwood, D.J. and Levin, M. 1998. *Introduction to action research: social research for social change*. Sage Publications, Inc. United Kingdom.
- Hagey, R.S. 1997 The use and abuse of participatory action research. *Chronic Diseases in Canada*, Volume 18, No. 1.
- McDougall, C, Prabhu, R. and Kusumanto, Y. 2003. Participatory action research on adaptive collaborative management of community forestry: a multi-country model. In Pound et al (eds) *Managing natural resources for sustainable livelihoods: using science and participation*. Earthscan, London.
- McTaggart, R. 1989. 16 tenets of participatory action research. Available at <http://www.caledonia.org.uk/par.htm#1>
- Milward, H.B. 1994. Implications of contracting out: new roles for the hollow state. In Ingraham, P.W and Romzek, B.S (eds) *New paradigms for government: issues for the changing public service*. Jossey-Bass Publishers, San Fransisco.
- O'Brien, R. 1998. An overview of the methodological approach of action research.
- Ngakan, P.O., Achmad, A., Wiliam, D., Lahae, K. and Tako, A., 2005. *The dynamics of decentralization in the forestry sector in South Sulawesi: the history, realities and challenges of decentralized governance*. Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia.

- Samsu, Suramenggala, I., Komarudin, H. and Ngau, Y. 2005. The impacts of forestry decentralization on district finances, local communities and spatial planning: a case study in Bulungan District, East Kalimantan. Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia.
- Sudirman, Wiliam, D. and Herlina, H., 2005. Local policy-making mechanisms: processes, implementation and impacts of the decentralized forest management system in Tanjung Jabung Barat District, Jambi. Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia.
- Tokede, M.J., Wiliam, D., Widodo, Gandhi, G., Imburi, C., Patriahadi, Marwa, J. and Yufuai, M.C. 2005. The impacts of special autonomy in Papua's forestry sector: empowering customary communities (*Masyarakat Adat*) in decentralized forestry development in Manokwari District. Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia.
- Wadsworth, Y. (1998) What is participatory action research? Action Research International, Paper 2. Available at <http://www.scu.edu.au/schools/gcm/ar/ari/p-ywadsworth98.html>
- Yasmi, Y., Anshari, G.Z., Alqadrie, S., Budiarto, T., Ngusmanto, Abidin, E., Komarudin, H., McGrath, S., Zulkifli and Afifudin. 2005. The complexities of managing forest resources in post-decentralization Indonesia: a case study from Sintang District, West Kalimantan. Center for International Forestry Research, Bogor, Indonesia.

ⁱ Researcher at the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), Bogor, Indonesia. He was trained in Participatory Action Research for Community-based Resources Management in 2003 and has been involved in research projects adopting the PAR approach such as CIFOR/ACIAR Decentralization and Forestry, and CAPRI' Collective Action to Secure Property Rights for the Poor

ⁱⁱ Researcher at the Center for International Forestry Research (CIFOR), based in Bungo District, Jambi, Indonesia. He was trained in PAR for CBFM in 2003 and has been heavily involved in the CIFOR/DfID Adaptive Collaborative Management project that employed the PAR approach

ⁱⁱⁱ Lecturer at the Forestry Faculty of Hasanuddin University, Makassar, South Sulawesi, Indonesia. He is an ecologist and has been involved, within the last four years, in the CIFOR/ACIAR Decentralization and Forestry research project. He was trained in PAR in 2004

^{iv} Lecturer at the Faculty of Economics, Jambi University, Jambi, Indonesia. He is an economist and was trained in PAR in 2004. He was formerly the head of the District Development Planning Agency (BAPPEDA) of Tanjung Jabung Barat District, Jambi and has been involved as a researcher with the CAPRI's "Collective Action to Secure Property Rights for the Poor" research project in Jambi

^v The Head of Social Affairs Section, Social and Cultural Division, District Development Planning Agency, Bungo District, Jambi Province. He has been in intensive interaction with many NGOs conducting research in the district, some of which have adopted the PAR approach. He was trained in PAR in 2004 and became a researcher with the CAPRI's "Collective Action to Secure Property Rights for the Poor" research project in Jambi

^{vi} Law No 32/2004 on Local Governance, which replaced Law No. 22/1999

^{vii} This was regulated by Presidential Decree No. 7/1999 on the Performance Accountability of Government Institutions, which provides a means for evaluation and assessment of the success or failure of a policy or program implementation, made by local government.

^{viii} Law No. 25/2004 on the National System for Development Planning

^{ix} This includes among others the district head's policies as included in a document called a *Program Kerja Kepala Daerah* or the Working Program of the District Head; Regional development policies as included in two documents, i.e. *Rencana Strategis* or Strategic Plans and *Rencana Kerja Perangkat Daerah* (RKPD) or the Working Program of the Regional Apparatus; General policies on District Budget; results from Provincial and Central Forums for Development Planning; and *Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Panjang* (RPJP) and *Rencana Pembangunan Jangka Menengah* (RPJM), or Long and Medium-term Development Plans, respectively.

^x This includes agreed proposals for development as a result of village, sub-district and district forums for development planning; and public input gathered from government official's visits to various regions and villages or from local people who submit proposals directly to the district offices.

^{xi} For example, in spatial planning development, a Law stipulates a need for local planners to take account of stakeholder's views and provide a legal basis for the public to participate in providing information to the land allocation processes and to submit complaints whenever they find irregularities