

## **CHAPTER ONE**

### **INTRODUCTION**

#### **1.1. Background**

The issues of public participation have arisen in recent years (Das, 2015b; Wang, 2014; Wukich & Mergel, 2015; Yang & Pandey, 2011). Whereas a decade ago, the literature was full of regrets about limited opportunities for public involvement, participation has become a key component of policy making and implementation (Azam & Mansoor, 2006; M. Buchy & Hoverman, 2000; Marlène Buchy & Race, 2001; Webler, 1999). As by the early 2000's, public participation had been a commonly performed and presumed feature of public policymaking (Bingham, 2011). Concerns between practitioners and scholars have shifted from whether there should be general recognition that, when well done, it can be very beneficial to decision-making, citizenship and inclusion (Bryson, Quick, & Crosby, 2012). Its practice has become increasingly professional: there is a large community of dedicated facilitators (Zinke et al., 1999), and constructing public participation knowledge is a common component to be done

(Antoci, Luigi, & Vanin, 2007). However, the methods of participation vary greatly, so there is a great deal of interest in how well they are designed and implemented (Halvorsen, 2001).

By engaging in the program implementation process, the public would understand the value of their participation in shaping their future (Meredith & MacDonald, 2017). According to Buchy and Race (2001), public participation in program implementation is a way of conveying the personal interests and concerns of individuals and communities with regard to development strategies, provided that such planning practices would also have an effect on the general public and on particular groups (Marlène Buchy & Race, 2001). Apart from acting as a way of informing and sensitizing people, public engagement is also essential to the creation of an efficient better planning system as a result of a better understanding of the interests and needs of stakeholders, which contributes to effective resource planning and management. Interestingly, the act of engaging in the structuring of the development plan allows people to reduce political and administrative issues while fostering accountability within the

professional climate (Lukensmeyer, Goldman & Stern, 2011), which in turn addresses perceptions of power disparities.

From the point of view of the public as part of the state, the invitation to take part in the implementation process is seen as a symbol of approval by the government. The public is influenced by the related development plan proposal and it is in the public interest to enable input in the implementation process, as this would encourage residents to engage in a whole on particular issues to ensure that the proposed plan represents their needs. In a wider sense, appropriate public engagement is essential to sustainable growth, provided that the planned development would be structured on the basis of the needs and demands of stakeholders, including the benefits for future generations, especially in environmental assessment sectors.

As stated by Sinclair and Diduck (2017) public participation has long been recognized as a pillar of environmental assessment (EA) (Sinclair & Diduck, 2017). Indeed, for others, the inherent validity of the EA mechanism is doubtful if the process does not allow for substantive participation (Das, 2015a; Pandebesie,

Indrihastuti, Wilujeng, & Warmadewanthi, 2019). In line with this, the majority of EA legislation provides for participation as a core element of the process and all have at least some realistic participation steps. The advantages of public participation in EA have been clearly illustrated in both theoretical and practical terms. A central theoretical argument is that participation updates the basic values of democracy and improves the social structure of society (Feng, Wu, Wu, & Liao, 2020; Yan, Farah, Gaskova, & Giabardo, 2020). This statement describes EA as a main mechanism by which the public may choose to engage directly in decisions affecting them. The related argument is that EA offers an individual and group empowerment tool (Fitzpatrick and Sinclair, 2003).

Public participation in waste collection and segregation at the source level for individuals is crucial to managing municipal waste (Maryati, Arifiani, Humaira, & Putri, 2018). Municipal authorities have failed to operate municipal waste efficiently and have also failed to raise awareness of the proper handling of waste and good practice of storing waste in separate wet and dry segregated bins

for individual households (Walls, 2004). Improper and lack of a basic facility for the collection of waste at source level on a regular basis are the results, disposal in open land, drainage, streets and nearby water bodies will create an unsafe environment in the surrounding area. In developing countries, waste management is a challenging task and the most commonly used non-scientific processes and sets their minds to conventional methods over limited access to their efficiencies.

Public participation in 3R (Reduce, Reuse, and Recycle) activities has been one of the notable programs in handling solid waste management in Indonesia and the Philippines. Both, Indonesia and the Philippines are facing the same environmental problems associated with waste management (Damanhuri & Padi, 2010). Even with the several waste activities programs i.e., waste recycling, waste selection, and even a waste bank. Yet, lack of public participation in the implementation of solid waste management still be the main reason that makes waste problem unsolved. Previous research on solid waste management shows that most of the main problem came from the lack of public

participation (Azam & Mansoor, 2006; Basu & Punjabi, 2019; Bing et al., 2016; Permana, Towolioe, Aziz, & Ho, 2015). The lack of public participation itself can be influenced by several factors such as public awareness, willingness (Zhang, Deng, Mou, Zhang, & Chen, 2019), and the perceived performance of leaders (Perlaviciute & Squintani, 2020). Awareness and willingness defined as a form of public attitude (Roland, 2004). Which also influenced and shaped by demographic, economic, people's psychological, social and culture, and political perceptions (Luo, 1998; Svallfors, 2010; Tufte, 1979; Worcester, 1993).

A number of scientific articles on sustainable waste management systems have been compiled from several literature databases starting from 1999-2020. The author uses the Systematic Literature Review (SLR) method in collecting and analyzing a number of these studies. SLR or systematic literature review is considered important as a "tool" to synthesize various previous studies because it can build on previous works, avoid bias, see the development of research trends, map the literature, and strengthen the capacity for future research needs. In addition, this study will

also demonstrate the proposed framework for looking at a sustainable form of waste management based on public participation. The research results are expected to be a bridge between research and policy regarding the future of waste management systems in Indonesia and the Philippines.

## **1.2. Research Questions**

It is understood that solid waste has become an unsolved problem in most developing countries. Government needs to prepare a high cost in regards to their unsolved solid waste. In the same time, a certain model of solid waste management could not guarantee the success of the program implementation. Therefore, public participation is believed as the answer to solve complexity in solid waste management. In regards to that matters, this research shall have the following specific questions, particularly regarding:

1. How does Indonesia and the Philippines government regulated and manage their Solid Waste Management?

2. How public participation can influence the establishment of sustainable solid waste management in Indonesia and the Philippines?

### **1.3. Research Objectives**

1. To establish how developing countries in SEA manage solid waste, especially in the case of Indonesia and the Philippines, two of the most populous country in the region
2. To understand how public participation can influence the establishment of sustainable solid waste management in Indonesia and the Philippines.

### **1.4. Scope and Limitation of Study**

A comparative study between the cities of Yogyakarta in Indonesia and Iligan City in the Philippines will be conducted by using participation as the main theories. This research will look into the development of SWM in both countries. This study will also analyze how public participation influence the maturity level of Solid Waste Management in both countries. This research is



limited to qualitative in design, which will utilize the descriptive approach as it will attempt to describe the pattern and trend happened in both countries. At the same time, this study will seek to analyze public participation involvement viz-a-vis the maturity of both Indonesia and the Philippines solid waste management development.

The discussion of this study is limited to public participation in the implementation of sustainable waste management in Yogyakarta, Indonesia and Iligan City, the Philippines. This study will not look into public participation on solid waste management in planning, decision making process, nor the evaluation process. A future research related to those certain level of participation should be done in aims to comply the study.