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Abstract
Indonesia’s first state-led community-driven development (CDD) began in 1990s with influential support by the World Bank. This paradigm sees the community not merely as an object but rather as an active subject of development. To ensure the shift at the paradigmatic level, a social engineering process known as community empowerment project was designed using monitoring instruments to guarantee inclusive development planning, prevent elite capture, and promote internal audit capacities. In this process, extensive use of bureaucratic instruments, e.g. paperwork, assessment forms, official stamps, program proposals/reports, and financial reports facilitated the formation of community participation. How did the use of documents shape the intended inclusive development projects under the CDD paradigm? This paper discusses the ironic trends of how the participatory framework in CDD, in fact, intensified social exclusions. The discussion is based on my experience observing the implementation of public consultation approach in PBDT 2015 (Pemutakhiran Basis Data Terpadu/Unified Database Updating). In such a program, the local stakeholders, together with community trustees at the kelurahan (village) level held a meeting to verify the enlisted poor households. The verification was crucial to create a unified database that could be used for future reference of the beneficiaries for several social assistance programs in Indonesia. I argue that tensions and negotiations toward deciding which names deserve to be on the list perpetuated forms of exclusion that embrace the exercise of prejudice based on ethnic and moral references in producing the hierarchy of deservingness at the community level.

Keywords: community development, participatory, social protection program, exclusion, politics of deservingness

Introductions
The striking phenomenon in development stories within the last twenty years, as stated by Roelen and Devereux (2013:1 in Ferguson, 2015:2) is “the rise and rise of social protection program” with cash transfer schemes as central mechanisms of the new anti-poverty programs. In Indonesia, the rise of social protection programs was preceded by the implementation of a Community Driven Development (CDD) paradigm after the demise of the authoritarian regime in 1998. Under the CDD paradigm, the “bottom up” or “participatory” approach appeared as a jargon celebrated and promoted by development planners, NGOs, as well as academics with an emphasis on “community empowerment”.

75
Such perspective is perceived as the antithesis of the previous “top-down” approach orienting to economic growth (see Prahara, 2016). As Cooke and Kothari (2001) have also pointed out, this new approach emerges as a recognition of the shortcoming of its top-down development counterparts. Development initiators believe that community participation is an important indicator to measure the successfulness of certain development projects in order to achieve their goals and outcomes. A further question then, is how does the involvement of the targeted community in decision making, implementation, and evaluation process matter to ensure inclusive and fair development?

At the end of 2014, I participated in a research project called “Public Consultation Study” (PCS 2014) held by the World Bank and Tim Nasional Percepatan Penanggulangan Kemiskinan/TNP2K (National Team for Accelerating Poverty Reduction). The project focused on mechanisms for updating household data for the poor population in Indonesia. The idea was to evaluate the updating processes in which such data would be available to be used to determine beneficiaries for upcoming social protection programs in Indonesia. Initially, the mechanism was tested through a project namely the community-based targeting approach (CTA) (Alatas, et al., 2012). The PCS 2014 project aimed to understand three aspects of the implementation of the CTA, i.e. feasibility, accuracy, and community satisfaction. In order to get those information, the project selected three areas in Indonesia as experimentation sites for the study: Surabaya City (East Java), Sragen District (Central Java), and Tanjung Jabung Timur District (Jambi). The result of this study was dedicated to designing a CTA model that would be applicable at national scale. Afterwards, in early 2015, TNP2K and Badan Pusat Statistik/BPS (Central Statistics Agency—Statistics Indonesia) held a national scale household-database updating activity called Pemutakhiran Basis Data Terpadu/PBDT 2015 by applying CTA that has been tested in PCS 2014. I was involved in the implementation of PBDT 2015 as a field researcher in three locations, including Bandung City in West Java, Pandeglang District in Banten, and Bima District in West Nusa Tenggara.

This paper is not intended to engage in an instrumental discussion about CTA and so does not provide any prescription regarding the implementation. Instead, this paper serves as an ethnographic reflection concerning document-mediated activity that appears as dominant features of PCS 2014 and PBDT 2015. As I argue elsewhere (Prahara, 2016), development and its practices are frequently associated with the production and circulation of certain forms of inscription—under the CDD paradigm, the form of community participation in most projects were, in fact, centralized in the intensification of inscriptional practices. These inscriptional practices, in many ethnographic studies about development in Indonesia has been treated only in passing. David Graeber (2015) points out, despite significant use of paperwork surrounding human existence, he asks, why is there no vast ethnographic writing related to such modern inscriptional practices? Elsewhere, Ben Kafka (2009: 341) observes, until recently historians (and also anthropologists) have “discovered all sorts of
interesting and important things looking through paperwork, but seldom paused to look at it”. In addition, Hull (2012: 12) states that anthropologists and other social scientists often produce and use documents as much as the way the people they study do.

Although there is a lacuna of meanings and problems in understanding the use of these documents, defining beneficiaries for social protection programs relies largely on inscriptive practices through household targeting surveys (pendataan). Although local authorities often received complaints regarding the accuracy of household data for social protection programs, sometimes leading to a violent protest in several areas in Indonesia, the production of inscriptive practices continues unhindered. However, any reflection regarding the role of inscriptive practices outside its instrumental functions is still rare. Thus, I saw the event of PBDT 2015 as interesting for ethnographic description in two ways. First, the very activity of PBDT was structured by a combination of two different ideologies of representation, i.e. panopticon and synopticon. Inspired by Foucault’s usage of Bentham’s panopticon (1979), Strauss explains that panopticon is “a construct that allows a single individual (or collective serving as an institutional representative) to observe many others simultaneously... in which powerful governmental institutions have the ability to observe, monitor and control a population of citizens” (Strauss, 2003: 41).

On the one hand, inscriptive practices such as household surveys are often associated with the panoptic ideology of representation since they are “bureaucratic writing that is seen as a by-product of state activity through which bureaucratic domination is exercised over populations” (Gupta, 2012: 142). On the other hand, community was instrumentalized with the synoptic ideology of representation within the participatory framework in PBDT 2015. Participants of PBDT 2015 that were framed as representatives of community were individuals who engaged in their immediate environment. Their participation was assumed based on personal relationships as members of the community. This way, they were seen as legitimate actors to participate in household data updating activities. As Strauss (2003: 53) further explains about the differences between panopticon and synopticon, the latter is “… a metaphor for joint production of image/knowledge/ideology—the cyborg that, though resolutely late modern, still breathes through the face-to-face Gemeinschaft, or community, of individual actors engaged in their immediate environments....”

The second area that I want to explore in this paper is the role of non-human agency in incorporating as well as eliminating the human subject. In order to do that, I follow Hulls’ direction in discussing the significance of documents in particular relations or events. Hull (2012: 13) argues that in order to “analytically restore the visibility of documents, to look at rather than through them, is to treat them as mediators, things that transform, translate, distort, and modify the meaning or the elements they are supposed to carry.” In line with Hull, my arguments derive from my approach to look at various forms of documents that are being used in CDD, and how they influence social relations, both with human and non-human subjects.

In this paper, I begin by providing a brief history of household surveys for social
protection programs in Indonesia, then discuss their transformation from panoptic to synoptic mechanism of database updating. The second section of this paper explores the process of community engagement in PBDT 2015 to reveal how this process is regulated by the “system of literary inscription” (Latour & Woolgar, 1989) and “graphic ideologies” (Hull, 2012). Finally, in the last section of the article I examine the way in which incorporation and elimination of human subjects in PBDT 2015 are enacted through active involvement of non-human agents such as documents.

**Targeting the Poor:**
**From Panopticon to Synopticon**

When the world’s oil prices began to rise rapidly in 2004, the Indonesian government had a few alternative solutions, but they opted for a radical fuel policy reform (Yusuf and Resosudarmo, 2008). In order to protect the purchasing power of the low-income population, the government executed a program involving unconditional cash transfer known as *Bantuan Langsung Tunai/BLT* (Unconditional Cash Transfer Program) in 2005 and 2008. Despite its controversy, BLT was perceived as clear evidence for the implementation of an unconditional cash transfer scheme as a short-term strategy to overcome negative impacts of the policy of reducing fuel subsidies (see TNP2K, 2013: 20). When similar events emerged in 2013, the Indonesian government applied the same strategy with a new name: *Bantuan Langsung Sementara Masyarakat/BLSM* (Temporary Cash Transfer Program). In addition, in mid-2013, the government launched *Kartu Perlindungan Sosial/KPS* (Social Protection Card), herein, the holder could claim benefits of BLSM and other social protection programs such as *Raskin* (program for the poor to access subsidized rice), *Beasiswa Siswa Miskin/BSM* (cash transfer for underprivileged students), and *Program Keluarga Harapan/PKH* (conditional cash transfer for poor households).

The social protection program continued to be implemented by the Indonesian government in the era of President Joko Widodo using a similar scheme. The famous Joko Widodo’s cards for social protection programs known as *Kartu Keluarga Sejahtera/KKS* (Household Welfare Card), *Kartu Indonesia Pintar/KIP* (Indonesia Smart Card), and *Kartu Indonesia Sehat/KIS* (Indonesia Health Card) are the manifestations of the same idea behind KPS card. All of these “new” cards have the same functions as KPS for the poor households to access benefits from the social protection programs. What makes Joko Widodo’s social protection program different is that it comes in three different cards. This way, each member of the targeted households could have their own card to access benefits from the social protection programs that specifically address their status.

Nevertheless, despite the various modifications in the mechanism for delivering the aid, the dynamics of the social protection programs remained dependent on the performance of household surveys. Since the first launching of the social protection programs by the Indonesian government, several household surveys targeting the poor have been conducted. In 2005, BPS produced database serving as a basis for determining beneficiaries of BLT through a household
survey called *Pendataan Sosial Ekonomi* /PSE (Social and Economic Survey). Before the PSE 2005, the only existing database of poverty in Indonesia was from *Survey Sosial Ekonomi Nasional* / SUSENAS (National Social and Economic Survey), started in 1979. SUSENAS is a macro data generated through a monetary approach. Since SUSENAS data consists only of predictions of the number of the poor population at the provincial level, it could not give detailed information about the names and the addresses of the targeted population that could be used for BLT distribution. To respond to this need, PSE 2005 was created as the first “by-name, by-address” survey that is continuously updated and improved as a basis for targeting the poor population (see TNP2K, 2013). The previous list of PSE 2005 was reviewed and updated through PSE 2008 for another BLT distribution.

However, one of the challenges in targeting the poor for a social protection program is the absence of unitary entry of targeted households. The reason is because most social protection programs in Indonesia work separately from one another and each program has their own targeting activity with different methods, even when they are actually looking for the same people. As a result, there was a huge variety of data with diverse characters of information. Addressing this problem, the idea of establishing a unitary entry for a social protection program emerged. In 2011, TNP2K launched the first unified registry of poor households, namely *Pendataan Program Perlindungan Sosial 2011* / PPLS11 (Social Protection Program Survey 2011). In PPLS11, the list generated from PSE 2008 was not simply revisited. Instead, all households in Indonesia were given a chance to be assessed; hence, new “poor” households could enter the list.

The next improvement in households targeting for the social protection programs was PBDT 2015. What makes PBDT 2015 exceptional compared to its predecessors is that it gives a community the chance to register new households into the new list through a community meeting whose activity is in line with what Strauss called the “synoptic joint-production of knowledge”. Furthermore, PBDT 2015 is in contrast with the frequently used targeting approach called Proxy-Mean Test (PMT) that is panoptic in character. Through PMT, the government collected information on assets and demographic characteristics to create a “proxy” for household consumption or income; in turn, this information is used to predict and define targeted actions (Alatas et al., 2012: 1207). In order to select beneficiaries for social protection programs, only those with incomes below a certain threshold (based on means-testing procedures) are eligible (Alatas et al., 2012: 1206). As an approach, the PMT has highly scientific procedures involving sophisticated equations and the use of specific software to render human subjects into various forms of graphic artefacts.

The whole sequential process starting from a door-to-door household survey, followed by a community meeting, and ending with data processing, presents what Latour and Woolgar (1989) call “system of literary inscription”. It refers to a procedure where material substance is transformed into a written form by using an “inscription device”. According to Latour and Woolgar (1989: 51), an inscription device is “… any item of
apparatus or particular configuration of such items, which can transform a material substance into a figure, or diagram, which is directly usable by one of the members of the office space.” In this regard, it includes various instruments such as questionnaires used by the government surveyor in the household survey, various kinds of computer software, and any other items of technical equipment. Furthermore, they explain, “[an] important consequence of this notion of inscription device is that inscriptions are regarded as having direct relationship to the “original substance”’ (Latour and Woolgar, 1989: 51).

In practice, household targeting in Indonesia uses a combination of PMT and community-based targeting approaches. The PMT is regarded as presenting more accurate data of household economic conditions due to its presumption that “… household assets are harder to conceal from government surveyors than income…” but somehow, as also recognized, “it misses out on transitory or recent shock” (Alatas et al., 2012: 1207). The CTA, on the other hand, is considered as a risky approach since it is prone to elite capture, while at the same time it captures the dynamic of household economic situation that the PMT fails to include. Central to the CTA’s claim in capturing “reality” is that the community is perceived as insiders who know better about their neighbours’ economic situation than the outsider central government officials. As Alatas et al. (2012: 1207) explain, “… in community-based targeting, the presumption is that wealth is harder to hide from one’s neighbours than from the government.” They further explain that the choice between the two approaches “is generally framed as a trade-off between the better information that communities might have versus the risk of elite capture in the community process” (Alatas et al., 2012: 1207). Briefly, despite the recognizable imperfection of both approaches in capturing “reality”, the whole sequence involving series of inscriptive practices in producing household data is considered representing the real situation they mediate.

**PBDT 2015: Incorporating community through inscriptive practices**

As I mentioned earlier, PBDT 2015 is the first large-scale household data updating in Indonesia that uses a community-based targeting approach. In the PBDT 2015, the previous list of PPLS11 was revisited and new households were registered into the list by community representatives at the village level. This process is mediated through a community meeting known as Forum Konsultasi Publik/FKP (Public Consultation Forum). I observed that village government apparatus, which consisted of village office staff and heads of neighbourhood associations known as RW/RT, were very enthusiastic to take part in FKP. This enthusiasm, however, was mostly preceded by unpleasant experiences, particularly during the BLT distribution, as local leaders often received complaints regarding the quality of household data produced by previous PPLS11 survey. From several interviews I conducted with FKP’s participants during my visits, PPLS11 was criticized mostly on two interrelated grounds: its accuracy and its lack of participation from the local authorities.

In FKP, the problem of accuracy of household data is intimately linked to local authorities’ experiences in implementing
welfare distribution programs such as *raskin* or BLT in their neighbourhood. They have observed that some of *Raskin* and BLT beneficiaries enlisted in PPLS11 are considered prosperous households (*mampu*) while others considered poor in their neighbourhood are excluded (technically termed as “inclusion error”). This problem often leads to protests and local leaders are likely to be accused for giving misleading information to the government, or at its worst: practicing *Korupsi Kolusi Nepotisme/KKN* (corruption, collusion, nepotism). The most frequently alleged wrongdoing was nepotism where local leaders registered their kindred into the list and therefore exclude the others—a practice that my informants in Surabaya called “*bolo-boloan*” or “elite capture” in experts’ terminology. Community representatives, however, claimed that the occurrence of this conduct was a result of the lack of community participation in the previous household survey. In this circumstance, local authorities perceived FKP as a chance to prevent the occurrence of similar practices in the future by improving the “government made” household data with “local inputs”.

Overall, the tasks that the community undertook in the document examination were highly technical. There were several inscription devices utilized in FKP in order to produce inscription of targeted households, i.e. (1) form of *PBDT2015.PPLS*; (2) form of *PBDT2015.Program*; (3) form of *PBDT2015.Lainnya*; (4) meeting minutes (*berita acara*); and (5) attendance list (*daftar hadir*). In this section I will first describe the use of *PBDT2015.PPLS* and *PBDT2015.Program* before I return to the *PBDT2015.Lainnya* in the next section of this article.

In examining the *PBDT2015.PPLS* and *PBDT2015.Program*, the community representatives have to fill in the forms by labelling each name of household in the list with predefined codes describing their status as follows:

**Box 1. Codes for households’ current status**

*Kode 1. Ada* (Code 1. Still exist)
The household(s) still exists and there are no changes on household address information.

*Kode 2. Tidak ada karena pindah* (Code 2. Moving to other place)
The household(s) no longer exists as they move to another place.

*Kode 3. Tidak ada karena meninggal semua* (Code 3. All members of the household have passed away)
The household(s) no longer exists as all of its members have passed away.

*Kode 4. Tidak dikenal* (Code 4. Unknown)
The household(s) name written in the document is unknown.

(Source: BPS, 2015)

---

1 *PBDT2015.PPLS* is pre-printed document consisted of the list of names and addresses of the households based on PPLS data. *PBDT2015.Program* is basically a similar form, except the source of names and addresses of the households is based in a survey made specifically for different social protection programs such as Raskin, BSM, PKH, KPS, PBI Jaminan Kesehatan, and Orang Penderita Kecacatan (ODK). Another form called the *PBDT2015.Lainnya* is an ‘extra’ form that could be used in case the community representatives need to register ‘new poor households whose names are not yet enlisted in *PBDT2015.PPLS* and *PBDT2015.Program*. 
Not only labelling each name with predefined codes in the form, community representatives also have to revise names and address when they find mistakes in the documents. For example, if they mark one name with *kode 2* (moving to other places) they have to replace the address with the new one. Moreover, since people often use different names and, therefore, are registered in the list with different names, the community representatives also have to check if there are names in the list that refer to the same person.

Since PBDT2015.PPLS and PBDT2015.Program are different in character, the examination of both documents is done using different approaches. In the household list in PBDT2015.PPLS, for example, each name of household is accompanied by information of one of the household members’ names, which could be helpful in the examination process to recognize which person is associated with the name written in the list. PBDT2015.Program, however, suffers from incomplete information such as vague address information and missing information about other household members. In the process, the community representatives take longer time in examining PBDT2015.Program document since it has to be clarified first using the PBDT2015.PPLS document to avoid double recording—which is frequently found by community representatives during the FKP—and with other documents such as family/household cards (*kartu susunan keluarga*) as references to complete the missing information. Due to limited time, however, not all names registered in the PBDT2015.Program list are successfully clarified through the FKP process.

The utilization of all these inscription devices in PBDT 2015 shows what Hull (2012) called graphic ideologies. According to him, “[g]raphic ideologies are sets of conceptions about graphic artefacts held by their users, including about what material qualities of an artefact are to count as signs, what sorts of agents are (or should be) involved in them, and what the roles of human intentions and material causation are” (Hull, 2012: 14). The manual for PBDT 2015 distributed to the officials involved in FKP is one example of written artefact that is associated with the graphic ideologies. In this regard, as a graphic ideology, the manual informs the detailed procedures including which document must be used in which circumstances, what sort of agents should be involved, and what sort of documents have to be produced. Graphic ideologies, therefore, govern all the technical procedure in the document-mediated activity in FKP with a certain degree of precision such as at which administrative level the FKP should be held (at the village level or at RW/neighbourhood level), where it should be held, what kind of people should be invited, how many people should be involved, what kind of activity may (and may not) be performed and what discourse should (and should not) be used. In this regard, I contend that graphic ideologies as practices in FKP, through its precision in its technical procedure, successfully squeeze out the non-technical elements that are embedded in community experiences regarding household data of PPLS11. In this sense, the previous chaotic protests regarding PPLS11 and the unpleasant experiences due to the unjust distribution of benefits in social protection programs are dissolved through the
technically ordered procedures of inscriptive practices. This way, I suggest that FKP constitutes a peculiar enterprise of representation and knowledge production: it renders apolitical social life while it overemphasizes technical problems (Li, 2007), and purifies messy knowledge and experiences into a clean structured representation (Kothari, 2001). Moreover, as I will elaborate in the next section, the technical precision that structures the activity of FKP contributes to the enactment of artefacts’ agentive capacity in incorporating and eliminating human subjects.

The role of non-human agents in incorporating and eliminating human subjects

The practice of incorporation and elimination of human subjects is central to the document-mediated activity in PBDT 2015. The technically termed “exclusion error” and “inclusion error” were two reliability problems occurring in the previous household data and thus needed to be solved through a community process. In this section, I will discuss how incorporation and elimination of human subjects are enacted through active involvement of graphic artefacts that is governed by certain graphic ideologies. The aim of my elaboration in this section, however, is not to demonstrate the elimination human agency in structuring the very activity of FKP, but to reveal the tacit agents which are the graphic artefacts. In this context, although the involvement of graphic artefacts is obvious, they often are treated merely as a passive medium to serve human intentions. In the implementation of FKP, it is true that human agents, who are often referred to as facilitators, play an important role in directing the process of documents examination undertaken by community representatives. Nevertheless, it is also obvious that the facilitators’ authorities and their particular capacities in structuring activities within FKP is only possible with the involvement of a certain form of graphic artefacts such as letters of assignment (surat tugas) and instruction letters from the national government to the local authorities. It is also true for community representatives that their involvement is made possible through a formal invitation (completed with letterhead and officials stamps) from local authorities. Hence, I argue that the phenomenon I observed in PBDT 2015 is made possible only within the practice of bureaucratic writing in producing various forms of graphic artefacts circulated through bureaucratic hierarchies.

Moreover, as I observed FKP, the production of inscriptions was not undertaken merely by translating material substance into graphic representations, but rather with excessive involvement of other forms of graphic artefacts to produce a single graphic representation. As I have already described in the previous section, detailed examination regarding names and addresses of households in PBDT2015.PPLS and PBDT2015.Program is undertaken by involving other documents such as bundles of family/household cards (KSK), identity cards (KTP), and population record books (buku induk). The involvement of such documents in FKP is preceded by instructions written in an invitation letter for community representatives that requests them to bring “relevant” documents when attending the FKP. In this regard, the involvement of other forms of graphic artefacts is not an
unintended consequence in the production of inscription, but is rather by-default mechanism of PBDT 2015.

This mechanism is in contrast with what I saw in PCS 2014 as the pilot project in Surabaya where the community meeting was divided into three stages. The first meeting held at the village level was the introduction of the technical procedures of FKP to RT leaders. Later, RT leaders were to hold a community meeting in their neighbourhood to examine the pre-list documents. In this pilot version of FKP, some RT leaders did not hold a community meeting but instead examined the documents by themselves. This resulted in some unintended variations in the examination process at the RT level. Some of the RT leaders examined the PPLS documents individually with the involvement of population record books (buku induk) and some other documents, while some other RT leaders also had a discussion with the people in the neighbourhood regarding the economic situation of their fellow neighbours before deciding which name was deemed “eligible”. Discussions between RT leaders and their fellow locals are crucial to have more thorough information since RT leaders sometimes do not have complete information about each name written on the lists, especially regarding their current economic situation. After they examined the documents, RT leaders brought the improved pre-list to the third community meeting that was aimed for a recapitulation. Here we have three stages of community process, i.e. (1) the socialization of technical procedures meeting, (2) the “in-situ” pre-list documents’ examination process, and (3) the data recapitulation meeting. Later, in the implementation of PBDT 2015, this three-stage process is shortened into a single community meeting.2 Since any discussion with other members of the neighbourhood is no longer possible, documents become the sole source that community representatives could rely on when examining the pre-list documents.

When documents become the sole source in the production of inscription, those who are not documented are the first to be excluded from the selection process. The fact that poor households are often moving from one place to another is incompatible with the permanent identification of domicile embedded in formal identity cards. Even if poor households are documented and hold graphic artefacts that prove their existence such as family/household card (KSK) and identity card (KTP), the information of household address written in the documents often do not correspond to the current status of their domicile. As I observed in Surabaya, some RT leaders insisted to register only those with KSK or KTP of Surabaya even though the facilitators did not ask them to do so. There were several reasons behind the exclusion of the non-Surabaya citizens through the document screening. One of the most frequent arguments forwarded by RT leaders is that they have very limited information regarding

---

2 The alteration from three-stage process into a single community meeting is part of the risk management strategy in PBDT 2015. With the three-stage process, there was a chance for community leaders to bring the documents to their home for the examination with other members of community. However, there was a concern from BPS regarding control mechanism to ensure that the documents would not circulated outside the community meeting. To address this concern, the government decided to cut off the three meetings process to one so that there is no chance for the documents to be copied or circulated outside the community meeting.
the economic situation of the mobile population who currently live in Surabaya. In an interview with an RT leader in one village in Surabaya, he told me that “in Surabaya they may look like poor [households] if we only consider the condition of their houses. But who knows if they have a lot of assets in their place of origin?” Another argument is that local authorities in their place of origin might have already registered them if they are “genuinely poor households”, therefore no need to re-register them in Surabaya. Exclusion practices of those who did not possess a legal document in FKP were confirmed by the existing household targeting activity conducted by the government of Surabaya for their municipal social protection programs. In such programs, KSK and KTP are two important documents for welfare distribution. In this context, the requirement of KSK and KTP ownership in household targeting activity constitutes “local” graphic ideology that informs the implementation of FKP. Moreover, the requirement to possess a particular form of document such as KSK and KTP in the household targeting activity that I previously found as “local” practices in Surabaya, turned out to be adopted in PBDT 2015.

As the examination process of the pre-list is compressed into a single meeting, community representatives have to deal with numerous documents and technical precision that leads them into a mechanical activity of filling forms. There are three documents that community representatives have to produce in the community meeting: the PBDT2015.PPLS, PBDT2015.Program, and PBDT2015.Lainnya. As I have already described in the previous sections, PBDT2015.PPLS and PBDT2015.Program are used to examine current status relating to the existence of the households on the lists. As names and addresses of households in PBDT2015.PPLS and PBDT2015.Program are examined, the community representatives also have the opportunity to mark some of the households in the lists that they consider no longer eligible. This activity is undertaken in order to address reliability problems in the previous documents. In the case of Surabaya, the community representatives were keen to mark some names in the pre-lists based on their consideration regarding households’ economic conditions. Since there were no rigid criteria that guide the selection process, each community representative used their own interpretation and judgement in their decision to include or to exclude names. From several interviews with FKP participants, possession of particular assets, ability to earn decent income, and number of dependents in the households are some of the indicators used to determine deservingness of particular households to be registered in the lists. However, the most frequent reason is that “there are a lot of people in the neighbourhood whose economic conditions are more severe than those on the lists.” This reason was used as a rationale to cross out some households from the eligibility lists.

In this context, the action to include or exclude people from the lists is directed by discourse mediated by an artefact (Hull 2012:23). In this regard, the enactment of PBDT2015.Lainnya documents to register new poor households during the FKP is an important event to understand the role of inscription devices both to incorporate and to eliminate people from a list. As written in
FKP’s manual, the form of PBDT2015. Lainnya could be used only if the participants propose additional households that are not enlisted on PBDT2015.PPLS and PBDT2015.Program documents. There are certain concerns from the officials regarding the registration of new households through a community meeting of FKP that force them to limit the number of proposed households. These concerns are related to the widely amplified presumption among officials regarding community that some people are keen to register themselves as poor, when in fact they are not, to get the benefits from the government. In an informal discussion with a few officials in Pandeglang, I was told that one concern regarding the additional households in FKP was the risk of an excessive number of “new” poor households resulting from FKP. Since the data gathered from community meetings would be assessed through a door-to-door verification survey, the number of additional households means extra workload for the surveyors as well as extra logistics. Moreover, the facilitators for FKP are “the front-line troops” that hold a task to control the number of additional households proposed by community representatives. In order to do this, the manual of FKP for facilitators gives practical suggestions on how they have to respond in a particular situation in FKP. The manual is as shown in the following box.

Box 2. An Instruction for facilitator in FKP’s manual book

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>JANGAN MENOLAK jika ada usulan rumah tangga namun JUGA JANGAN DITERIMA SEMUA. Untuk itu fasilitator agar mengatur strategi dan “pandai-pandai” memandu pertemuan FKP agar suasana tetap kondusif.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DO NOT REFUSE if there is a proposal to register (new) households BUT DO NOT ACCEPT ALL. Therefore, facilitators have to set up a strategy and “be clever” in facilitating FPK meeting in order to be conducive.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Source: BPS 2015:29)

In addition, the facilitators are also equipped with the list of criteria that can be used as a guide for community in proposing households. The criteria are as follows (BPS, 2015: 48):

- Member(s) of the household has physical or mental disabilities;
- Member(s) of the household has prolonged chronic disease;
- High dependency burden of household due to having school age children, elders (lansia), and unemployed household members;
- Considered locally as very poor household.

In the activity of adding new households, I observe that the list of criteria did not only function as a technical guide, but also as an external source of power that mediates facilitators’ agentive power in FKP. The list of criteria functions that way when facilitators refer to it as a “rule” that is set from “above” every time they announce the criteria of
households’ selection in the community meeting (kriteria yang telah ditetapkan oleh pemerintah).

Although the manuals suggest the facilitators to write down the names of households in the form of PBDT2015.Lainnya, in practice it is not always the case. In Bandung, following the instructions in the manual, the facilitators wrote down the names of households in the form of PBDT2015.Lainnya as they are being mentioned by the community representatives. Before facilitators wrote down the names in the forms, they would ask several questions to the community representatives who proposed the names to make sure that the household is “genuinely” poor. In Bima, the forms of PBDT2015.Lainnya were filled in by the community representatives and once they finish the task, facilitators assessed the additional households. Despite the variations, the assessment process is the most critical moment where negotiation between facilitators and community representatives is inevitable. In Bima, one RT leader wrote several names in the list. One of them was a widow with dependent children whom he considered as poor households. When he brought the list to the facilitators, the widow’s name was crossed out with the argument that the widow is still “young” and still has the chance to re-marry in the future. Based on such judgement, the facilitators excluded the widow from the list even though the reason of the elimination can hardly be found in the criteria provided in the manual.

Concluding remarks

To conclude, I suggest that the way to treat the document by looking at rather than through (Hull, 2012) is a productive approach to acquire an ethnographic insight on the way in which the world is framed, categorized, and ordered within current development practices. Through household targeting activities we see how the government do not simply reproduce social relations into another medium, namely a pre-list of targeted households, but also transform it into the enactment of particular graphic artefacts that are continuously produced and circulated. Rather than perceiving the artefacts as a mere medium that is “used” by human subjects, I argue that it is the community itself that is positioned as an instrument for the enactment of graphic artefacts in PBDT 2015. The notion of community, which is associated with direct engagement in the immediate environment, is a widely circulated discourse that—in the case of community-based targeting approach—mediates the significance of a particular form of graphic artefacts as well as its capacity to represent what the community addresses as the truth. In PBDT 2015, “the community participation” in household targeting programs is constituted in inscriptional and graphic forms such as meeting minutes (berita acara), attendance lists (daftar hadir), signatures of community representatives, and official stamps. These documents serve as the main artefacts that determine the significance of household lists’ documents resulted from community meetings. Moreover, as facilitators and participants are submitted to a particular technical procedure, human actors do not always dominate the mechanism for incorporating and eliminating human subjects.
In this regard, I suggest that both documents and human subjects are entangled and co-constituted to shape the politics of deservingness within the CDD program.
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