

EXCLUSIVITY OF PUBLIC POLICY; HOW IS THE IMPACT OF THE POLICY?

Irmayani Misrah, Desiderius P. Sudibyo and Rina H. Haryanti

Master of Public Administration, Faculty of Social and Political Science, Sebelas Maret University,

ABSTRACT

Exclusive policy of traditional market building for indigeneous inhabitants in Papua has the aim to overcome the economic gap between the indigeneous and non indigeneous inhabitants in Papua. The market is built by the regional government as a concern towards the native traders of Papua who have no proper place to trade. Most of the trade is authorized by entrepreneurs from outside Papua. This research is aimed to analyze the effects of the policy. The method of the research used qualitative approach through field study. The result of the research shows that after the policy was implemented, there are more unexpected effects. The policy is expected to develop the native traders of Papua and avoid the authority of traders from outside Papua. However, the policy cannot be implemented as well. Market is mostly dominated by the traders from outside Papua.

KEYWORDS: Policy exclusivity, traditional market, policy effects, indigeneous inhabitants of Papua

INTRODUCTION

Papua is one of provinces in Indonesia that obtains policy of special autonomy. As stated in law no.21 of 2001 about special autonomy for Papua province, it reveals that special autonomy for Papua is basically the giving of broader authority for province and its inhabitants to manage themselves in the structure of the unitary state of republic of Indonesia. Djojosoekarto (2008) states that the giving of special autonomy for Papua is aimed to realize the justice, law supremation enforcement, human rights respect, economy building speed, welfare improvement and citizens advance in Papua to create balance towards another advance in other provinces. The laws put the indigeneous inhabitants of Papua and its common inhabitants as the main subjects.

By the existence of special autonomy, the province government has more domination to manage and utilize the potentials in the region. One of the policies issued by the government of Jayawijaya concerns about the building of traditional market of Potikelek. The market is as one of the realizations of exclusivity concept with affirmative action. According to Indonesian dictionary, the term of exclusive means separated from other or special. Exclusivity is making something special or separating from others. Supian (2016) states that exclusivity means bordering self to avoid other sides entering into the range. It happens in Potikelek market in which the traders from outside Papua are not allowed to trade because the market is only for the native traders of Papua.

Affirmative action is a policy which concerns to a certain social group to achieve the same opportunity like other groups. Sayuti (2013) reveals that affirmative action is the most used way by the state as the solution upon the discriminative social condition, imbalance and marginalization in

all life sectors as the effects of patriarchal structure in public and private sectors. This action is a positive discrimination aimed to accelerate achieving the justice and balance. Umar (2015) states that economic justice can not possibly achieve if there is no special treatment and affirmative action to the indigenous inhabitants. They must be given special treatment and affirmative action to achieve the justice.

The market is a concern of regional government in accelerating the building, increasing economic welfare and advance for inhabitants in Papua especially the indigeneous people. The market is a resident market which is usually called market of Mama-mama Papua. The market has been expected since long time by the indigeneous people. The desire on having their own market is caused by the economic gap between the indigeneous and non indigeneous inhabitants in Papua. In the economic competition, non indigeneous inhabitants are more advanced and developed than the indigeneous ones.

It can be seen from the domination of the entrepreneurs from outside Papua that always develop. Most of all sectors are dominated by the entrepreneurs from outside Papua (www.papualives.com). Most of non Papua inhabitants have their own good place such as store, kiosk, mini restaurant and etc. Meanwhile, the indigeneous ones trade their goods in the street. They become the street vendor because they have no proper and comfortable place to develop their trade.

This condition is a public problem that needs government intervention in order that the indigeneous and non indigeneous people of Papua can live and run the economy harmoniously without any oppression. Nugroho (2014) stated that the best public policy can encourage each resident to build their own competition and avoid the way of dependence. Public policy is a media to manage the social and state living. Its existence is really needed to overcome every problem. Kusumanegara (2010) states that public policy is theoretically aimed to overcome public and policy problem. It shows that public policy is important for society in a state. However, this policy must be managed well. If the management is not right, it will not be effective and raise the unexpected effects for society.

Therefore, the research on the policy exclusivity becomes important to be conducted because if the exclusive policy with affirmative action cannot be managed well, it can raise unexpected effects for society. There were several empirical results from the finding of the research conducted by Sumardi (2012) concerning with special policy in North Aceh. It shows that the program of economy policy in North Aceh in eliminating poverty and developing welfare has not been optimum. On the contrary, the number of poverty is higher. The main problem is the inadequate human resources. Leadership problem of the regional leader must prioritize the building in several sectors such as welfare, education and health. A research by Kubangun (2014) related to affirmative action policy in Manokwari finds out that affirmative policy and its representation in bureaucracy in the law of special autonomy to support the indigeneous inhabitants is successful. However, the problem is that

the placement is not for non indigeneous inhabitants in general. It emphasizes on the race. There is a result of problem such as the development of new autonomy region that mostly oriented to the race. There is also the demand from the society which creates the blocking action. This action might access on public budgeting, public service and corruption.

Another research by Fretes (2015) states that special autonomy policy in Papua creates several local elite attitudes in Papua. The result of the research shows that local elite of Papua which becomes part of the bureaucracy tends to support the special autonomy as the way to utilize the policy for its interest. The refusal upon the special autonomy is from the local elite which belongs to outside government structure. For this group, special autonomy is supposed to be failed and only gives advantages for the elite or certain group. Apathetic local elite supposes special autonomy as the last solution from central government. For this group, central government will not give more special autonomy. Therefore, it raises unconcern towards the implementation or the impacts of special autonomy.

The research conducted by Sumardi (2012), Kubangun (2014), and Fretes (2015) related to exclusive policy, it shows that the three raise the unexpected impacts for the special sides. This condition is theoretically and empirically attracted to be deeply studied. The exclusive policy in Jayawijaya regency related to traditional market of Potikelek is stated in regent instruction no. 01 of 2014. It indicates the same thought as stated by Sumardi (2012), Kubangun (2014), and Fretes (2015).

Therefore, the research about exclusivity policy concerning with the building of traditional market of Potikelek is important to conduct. After being implemented, there are many problems happen such as the action of indigeneous traders of Papua who refuse to relocate to Potikelek market. They assume that there will be less buyers and the income will reduce. There might also be crime such as pick pocketing because the safety will be less. Another reason is that there is a demand of giving financial capital by the government to the indigeneous traders of Papua. It strengthens the gap between *das sein* and *das solen* in implementing the policy of Potikelek market building. The implementation must give positive impacts, but the reality is opposite.

Based on the explanation above, this research will analyze the impacts of the exclusive policy concerning with the establishment of traditional market of Potikelek in Jayawijaya, Papua. The policy is the implementation of project with physical action. Wibawa et al (1994) states that the policy implementation is a process that is interpreted as a program and project followed by physical action.

Wibawa et al (1994) explains that the policy implementation creates consequences such as results, effects and impacts. One of the policy consequences might be impact. Impact is a change of physical or social condition as the impact of policy (Wibawa et al, 1994). The impacts might be expected and

unexpected. When the policy is made, the government has determined the impacts that will happen. The unexpected impacts are not expected by the policy makers (Wibawa et al, 1994).

METHODS

This research is a qualitative-descriptive research. The location of the research was in Jayawijaya regency, Papua. The informants of the research were determined by purposive sampling. The informants are supposed to be the person who knows and involves in the policy implementation of the establishment of Potikelek market. It refers to the regent instruction no. 1 of 2014 about the utilization of Potikelek market.

The sources of data in this research are primary and secondary. Primary data was obtained through interview and observation. Secondary data was obtained through documentation study. Technique of analyzing data used interactive analysis technique by Miles and Huberman (1994). The technique was conducted by reducing irrelevant data towards the problems and displaying data through table and picture and taking conclusion as the last result of the research purpose.

CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

Evaluation of policy impacts

Wibawa et al (1994) states that there are 2 kinds of evaluation activities, such as;

1. Implementation evaluation that attempts to see the implementation process. It relates to the conductors and how it runs. It will also relate to the steps in making the policy.
2. Policy impacts evaluation give more concerns on output and impact of policy than on its implementation process.

In implementation evaluation of a policy, the impacts of the policy also take more concerns on short or temporary term. Meanwhile, in evaluating the impacts, it observes the long and permanent impacts of the policy implementation.

According to Westra (1983), there are three types of evaluation related to the level of the programs, such as:

1. ex-ante evaluation

Ex-ante evaluation is conducted before the program is implemented. It is conducted to estimate the needs or the statement of building needs and determine the potential aims of a program of group building.

2. ongoing / concurrent evaluation

Ongoing evaluation is conducted when the program is implementing. In the spacing step, the program is implementing and evaluating.

3. ex-post evaluation

The evaluation is conducted after the program is implemented to assess the impacts and influences of the program by measuring how far the program can achieve the aims.

Based on the type of policy evaluation above, when the researcher conducts a research related to the three evaluations above, the evaluation must be clear. It means that there must be a special thing from each evaluation type. The clarity will also help the person to understand certain policy precisely. In this research, there will see the impacts of the policy when the program is implementing. The policy of Potikelek market building in Jayawijaya has been implemented since 3 years ago. Based on the type of the evaluation above, this research belongs to on-going evaluation. It will not evaluate the impacts, but it only see the impacts when the program is being implented.

Furthermore, Dunn in Wibawa (1994) states that the impacts of policy is the change of physical and social condition as the impacts of policy output. Output can be goods, services and other facilities received by certain society which can be objective group or other groups. Outcome and impact are consequences of a policy.

Furthermore, Wibawa (1994) states that in evaluation study on policy impacts will raise the unexpected and expected impacts. The expected impacts mean that when the policy is made, the government has determined the impacts that will follow. At the final implementation, there will also appear unexpected and expected impacts, and wanted and unwanted impacts (Wibawa, 1994). In this research, there will be two impacts from the implementation of the policy of Potikelek market building.

Evaluation method

Finsterbusch and Motz (1980) in (Samudra, 1994) states that there are several methods of evaluation that can be used to evaluate the programs;

a. Single program after only

It is a kind of evaluation which conducts a measurement of condition or assessment towards the program after examining each variable of the program criteria. The analyst does not know the good or bad response of the objective group towards the program. It is the weakest design with 2 reasons: (1) evaluator does not know the good or bad response of the objective group towards the program and (2) evaluator does not know whether the objective group has no good advantages and whether another thing does not create the good condition.

b. Single program before-after

It is a completion of the first type. There is a data about the aims of the program before and after the program is implemented.

c. Comparative after only

It is a completion of the second evaluation. It is not for the first and the analyst only see the condition of the target.

d. Comparative before-after

It is a combination of the three designs. The achieved information is the effects of the program towards the objective group.

Evaluator can use the controlling and experimental group. Experimental group is a group that obtains the program and policy. Controlling group is a group that has no programs but it has the same characteristics with experimental group. Evaluator can also compare the condition before and after it is implemented. It can also only see the condition after certain program is implemented. Each type of evaluation will result different kinds of information and data. There is a methodology to evaluate the program that can be seen at table 2.2 below;

Table 2.2 Methodology to evaluate policy

Types of evaluation	Measuring condition		Controlling group	The received information
	Before	After		
<i>Single program after only</i>	No	Yes	Not available	The condition of objective group
<i>Single program before-after</i>	Yes	Yes	Not available	The change of objective group
<i>Comparative after only</i>	No	Yes	Available	The condition of objective and controlling group
<i>Comparative before-after</i>	Yes	Yes	Available	The effect of programs towards objective and controlling group

Source : Finsterbusch and Motz (1980) in (Wibawa, 1994).

Based on the several types of evaluation methods above, the researcher on this research used “Single program before-after.” This research will see and study the research object by comparing the condition before and after the policy was implemented. Wibawa (1994) explains that evaluator and researcher can obtain the data about the target of the program in before and after the program was running. It tends to conduct evaluation study of “Single program before-after.”

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Potikelek market is the first traditional market in Papua for the native traders of Papua. It also becomes the first sampling market for all cities and regencies in Papua and west Papua. The market is built in a more than 1 hectare of land. It consists of 48 kiosk units and 15 stores in which the sellers can sell the vegetable. It is also completed with several supporting facilities such as 1 room for public order enforcers, 8 public toilets and 2 official houses of department of industry and trade. The market started to build in 2011 and lasted in 2014. The budget of the building was from several fund sources such as assistance task, public allocation funds, special allocation funds, fund sources of special autonomy and result sharing funds. Total of budgeting allocation was around 34.395.242.000 billions.

Based on the data from the agency of working labor, trade and industry of Jayawijaya, there are 250 native traders of Papua who will occupy the traditional market of Potikelek. After the first and second year, the activity of the market had been up and down. Most of the kiosk did not operate. There were only several traders of mama-mama who still were there. They were selling vegetables, areca, firewood and rattan. The condition was supposed to be the cause of the quiet market. There were many complaints from mama-mama because the market was too quiet. They asked for fund assistance for financial modal. The quiet market also triggered a new problem. It encouraged mama-mama to return to their previous place. They went back to trade in the street.

There was an explanation about the impacts of the policy issued by the regent of Jayawijaya about the policy of Potikelek market building as followed:

1. The unexpected impacts

There are several impacts expected by the government of Jayawijaya regency, such as:

a. Avoid the monopoly of the non-Papua traders

Monopoly is a practice of dominating goods and service conducted by individual or group to enrich themselves. As stated in law no 5 of 1999 article 1, monopoly is a domination of production or marketing the goods and services by the traders or traders group. Monopoly of non-traders Papua is conducted through dominating more than 1 trade. The domination can be in the form of kiosks and services owned by a trader. As a sample, a trader can have more than one kiosk. As it happened in Jayawijaya, most of trading sector in economy is dominated by immigrants from outside Papua (non Papua). This phenomenon has happened for a long time. It happened when Jayawijaya still had one traditional market as the central market in the regency. The number of kiosk had not been too many, but most of them were owned by non-Papua traders. There was also found that one trader can have 5 or 6 kiosks. It was supposed to create disadvantage for other traders. It is said by Mr. TW (assistant 1 of Jayawijaya regent) that:

“It is not the first problem. Monopoly has happened to the previous market (Nayak market). We can learn from that case. There is a trader with five or six places and it creates disadvantages for other

traders. From that case, the regional government must avoid to do monopoly. One trader must only have one place. The regulation is for all traders (newcomers and native traders)” (interview, February 2018).

Mr. TW states that the regulation about the ownership of a trade has not been written. It is only through SKPD technique:

“The regulation is not written. However, the SKPD policy manages it as well. It can be seen when they propose. It is not shared, but they propose. We can see their profile” (interview, February 2018)

The low regulation about the limitation of trading ownership of non-Papua traders causes the practice of monopoly does still exist until now. Most of trading sectors in Wamena are dominated by the entrepreneurs from outside Papua. The development and distribution of kiosk and stores owned by non-Papua traders is so fast. One of the areas which has fast development is the west of Wamena in street Hom-hom Muai Distrik Hubikiak. In 2005, this area was still closed by the dense forest. Kiosks are only seen in the three junction of street Hom-hom Moai and Trans Irian. Now, there are about 350 kiosks in the edge of the street Hubikiak. Most of the kiosk were owned by non-Papua traders. It is said by Mr. WP as follows:

“this area is very quiet. Moreover, Moai area has been covered with forest in 2005. We can see kiosk in the three junctions (three junction of Hom-Hom Moai street and Trans Irian). The kiosk is not too many like now. If i say, Wamena is like a magic. It can be seen from the corner of Hom-Hom street to Muai, there have been many kiosks owned by non-Papua traders (Interview, May 11 2018)

The same phenomenon also happens in several areas in Wamena (in the north corner, Sinakma market in Honailama and Napua district, Jayawijaya regency. Stores and kiosks owned by non-Papua traders are located there. The ownership of more than 1 kiosk has been found in everywhere in Wamena. It can be found at the east of Wamena (Wouma district and south of Wamena or Wesaput district and its around). This area used to be an outskirts in which there were no stores. There were only small kiosks with simple management. In 2014, there were many empty lands in this area. There were many stores built under the management of non-Papua traders. It created anxiety for the indigeneous people because the opportunity for trading was smaller. It was stated by one of the residents of Wesaput district named TJ:

“Wesaput is from Baliem to the airport. There are many kiosk owned by new comer. If a person has a new kiosk, then they rent it to others. The building of the kiosks has been started in 2014 till now. Baliem river has had a bridge. In the future, they will build another one. It’s cautious for us because the new comers have dominated our area. It is very difficult (Interview, May 2018)

Based on the condition above, he is afraid that there will be no opportunity for native traders to live their life as traders in their own land. It is not only in the central city or outskirt, the new comers start to enlarge their trading into the districts that they suppose as the business opportunity.

Through the policy of Potikelek market building in Jayawijaya regency, it was expected that it could reduce the trading monopoly conducted by non-Papua traders. However, it happened on the contrary. Based on the result of the research, the government had provided the native traders with 48 stores and 15 kiosks and its facilities. However, due to the limitation of human resources in managing the trading, the facilities were taken over by non-Papua traders. There was also border and prohibition for non-Papua traders not to sell and import the vegetables and all commodities that had been sold by the native traders. The regulation was actually aimed to reduce the monopoly of non-Papua traders and gave the opportunity to the native traders to participate in developing the economy in their own land. However, the regulation was not long last because there was a lack of preparation and human resources. It raised the opportunity for non-Papua traders to enlarge their business. The economic building was not followed by the economic empowerment of the native inhabitants. As a result, the native inhabitants could not compete with others in trading.

The society empowerment in Papua was still less. Therefore, all business sectors in Jayawijaya were still dominated by non-Papua traders. WG said as followed:

“the empowerment for the native inhabitants is still low. It can be seen the new comers has dominated the trade. We can take an example. Areca is now also being sold by the new comers. So, where is the empowerment? the government must be strict. They must create a regulation that the new comers may not be too dominated. If they have had their own business outside Papua, they must not open another business in Papua (Interview, May 2018)

Based on the statement above, it can be concluded that the native people of Papua still suppose that monopoly of the new comers still continue. It creates anxiety for the native people that the existence of new comers will threaten them. The building of Potikelek market was aimed to reduce the monopoly of non-Papua traders. However, it was not a good solution. The market building without any native trader empowerment became very influential in this matter. The facilities provided by the government had not been able to be managed by the native traders. It caused non-Papua traders to continue the business. It raised an impression that monopoly happened again in managing Potikelek traditional market.

b. Increase the economic welfare of native traders of Papua

Economic welfare in this research is seen from the income level of native traders before and after the relocation of Potikelek market in Jayawijaya. Based on explanation above, Potikelek market was built for native traders of Papua. They were supposed to participate in the activity of economic building in Jayawijaya and increase the living welfare of native traders

Most of native traders were dominated by women. They were usually called Mama- mama Papua. They were relocated to Potikelek traditional market. Before the relocation policy to Potikelek was conducted, they were street vendor who sold local vegetables. The vegetables were taken from their garden. However, they also bought them in central market (Jibama market). Then, they sold them in retail with higher price. The selling system still used traditional way. They did not use calculator or scale as the non-Papua traders did. The vegetables like chilies, tomatoes, beans, mustard greens, onions and etc were sold by making a little heap. They were arranged and sold with the determined prices. For example, one heap of chilies was 10.000. So, another vegetable was also sold with the same price. Even though they sold with expensive price, their goods were still sold well because they were located in a strategic place. Most of the sellers could buy the goods easily because it was located in the middle city. Mama YM as one of the traders in the market stated that:

“before the government moved us to Potikelek market, the income in a day was fair because there were many vegetables sold well. Sometimes, we can gain profit from 50.000 to 100.000 in a day. But, after we were moved to Potikelek market, the vegetables were not sold well. The number of buyers was low. The new comers have joined us here. It makes the buyers come along. But, most of them buy at the new comers. We usually get 30.000-40.000 in a day. I think there are more times to sell outside. Eventhough, it is just a bit. It is better because we used to have nothing” (Interview, March 2018)

Based on the explanation above, the income level of *Mama-mama* has decreased after the relocation. The sama statement was also stated by *Mama JN* (one of the native traders who still survived in Potikelek). The effort by joining non-Papua traders to Potikelek did not give any change for them to increase the income.

“It’s difficult to get the income like we used to get. Till now, Mama-mama still sell in Irian street. Here is just a few. So, the buyers must be divided. Most of the buyers are going there. If we all are here, it must be crowded. The new comers have made our market crowded. If they are not here, it will be quiet. My income is not as much as when I sell there. I have many costumers. I used to spend 800.000 to buy vegetables in Jibama. But now, it doesn’t. Now, I spend 200.000 to buy the vegetables because I don’t buy too much (Interview, March 20, 2018)

Based on the above statements, the policy about the building of Potikelek traditional market has not been effective. It can be seen from the income of the native traders. Most of the traders still want to survive to trade in Potikelek market. However, they still complain because of the low income and buyers. Eventhough non-Papua traders have joined there, their income remains the same. It is different when they trade in the street. Half of them choose to trade in Safri Darwin and Irian street. It became the factor of the low buyers in Potikelek market.

1. Unexpected impacts

There are also several unexpected impacts, such as:

a. Potikelek traditional market is built for native traders of Papua. Now, it is dominated by non-Papua traders.

Potikelek traditional market is built for native traders. The building of the market is aimed to increase local society empowerment and participate to develop the economy in Jayawijaya regency. As stated before, most of economy sector in Jayawijaya are dominated by non-Papua traders. It raises social gap between the native traders and non-Papua traders. The gap raises conflicts and jealousy towards non-Papua traders. Based on this problem, Jayawijaya government built Potikelek market in 2011. In 2014, it was officially announced. It was aimed to improve the social living of the society and develop the quality of life. However, the reality was not appropriate with the expectation. The native traders were expected to be able to manage the market. In reality, the market was dominated by non-Papua traders.

The function of the market after being implemented for 3 years has not been optimum. It becomes the main factor. It encourages the native traders to trade in the street. Besides that, the low human resources encourage them to sell and rent their kiosks to the non-Papua traders. They admit that they have not been ready yet to manage the big market without any help from non-Papua traders. The government has relocated Mama-mama to occupy Potikelek market. But, they propose a requirement to the government that the non-Papua traders join to their market. The government granted their request because the market was quiet and they could not manage the market well. The explanation above has given the answer about the real situation in the field. The market has been dominated by non-Papua traders.

b. There are many native traders in Irian and Safri Darwin street.

Based on the result of the research in the field, it is found that the location of Safri Darwin street still can not be vacated. On the contrary, the trading location is larger and fulfill the sidewalk of Irian street. The condition is worse with the fishmongers who sell the fish there. The location becomes more crowded and uncontrolled. The low control from public order enforcers becomes one of the factors that cause the traders sell the goods along Safri Darwin and Irian street. The controlling was not conducted continuously. Therefore, the native traders felt free to trade there. Besides that, people who lived in the city preferred to shop in Irian and Tawes street because it was safer and closer to their house. Mrs. TG, one of the buyers said that:

“It is almost everyday I come to this market. Honestly, if I shop to other markets, I am doubt and scared. The situation is not safe and stable in Wamena. I am afraid when I am shopping there will be conflicts as happened yesterday. So, I decide to shop to Mama-mama. Eventhough the price is a bit higher, I will be safe (Interview, March 2018).

The statement above shows that the situation around Safri Darwin and Irian street is safe and comfortable. The buyers will be easy to shop and it encourages other traders to start their business

there. Based on the observation, there were many new comers who joined the market in Irian street. The traders were not the new sellers. Most of them moved from another market and joined the old traders. The result of the interview to one of Mama-mama (Mama YM) is as follows:

“I am here in the afternoon. At 3 p.m I start selling. In the morning and afternoon, I go to Wouma market. If there are still many goods to sell, I bring it here” (Interview, March 2018)

The native traders were not only from Potikelek market. They were also from different location who joined to trade there. The location around Safri Darwin and Irian street became more crowded. The condition was not expected before. This condition was difficult to control because there were too many traders in the street.

Based on the explanation above, there are several findings after the policy of Potikelek market building has been implemented for 4 years. The policy creates more unexpected impacts than the expected ones. There is no objective group empowerment and los human resources that become the main factors of the condition. It becomes worse because the government is not consistent in making the regulation related to the trading permission to the native traders or non-Papua traders.

Therefore, to achieve the economic justice for society, special treatment and affirmative action is not the only solution of exclusive policy. The policy can be applied if the human resources are adequate and can be managed well. If it is not implemented, the condition becomes worse and creates more unexpected impacts for society.

CONCLUSION

The implemented policy will exactly give consequences of impacts. The impacts might be expected and unexpected. The policy of Potikelek market building in Jayawijaya creates more unexpected impacts than the expected ones. The policy is aimed to improve the economy of native traders and eliminate the monopoly of non-Papua traders. However, It does not happen as they expect. The market is now dominated by the non- Papua traders.

It happens because the policy is not made by empowering the target group. The regional government needs to arrange several policies related to the empowerment by opening informal skill course which is aimed to improve entrepreneurship skill for native traders. Besides that, the empowerment can also be conducted to the young generations through education by training them in a kiosk, store, mini restaurant, phone counter and other business field. It is expected that the generation of native traders will be more developed and independent in managing the economy.

Besides that, the regional government must improve the awareness and understanding for native traders about the bussiness potential related to the natural resources in Papua. It must also be accompanied by the assistance of empowerment to strengthen the entrepreneurship skill for native

traders. In the future, it is expected that they can manage their business effectively and enable them to create more income and bigger working opportunity.

REFERENCES

- Arianty, Nel. 2013. Analisis Perbedaan Pasar Modern dan Pasar Tradisional Ditinjau dari Strategi Tata Letak (Lay Out) dan Kualitas Pelayanan untuk Meningkatkan Posisi Tawar Pasar Tradisional. *Jurnal Manajemen & Bisnis* Vol 13 No.01. Universitas Muhammadiyah Sumatera Utara.
- Archobong, adejumo, & Phil. 2013. Affirmative Action in South Africa ; Are We Creating New Casualties ?. *Journal Of Psychological Issues in Organizational Culture*. efeVol. 3, No. S1
- Bernard, I, Chaster. 1992. *Organisasi dan Manajemen Struktur, Prilaku dan Proses*. Jakarta: Gramedia.
- Dunn, William N. 2003. *Analisis Kebijakan Publik*. Yogyakarta: Gadjah Mada University Press.
- Mahmudi. 2005. *Manajemen Kinerja Sektor Publik*. Yogyakarta: UPP AMP YKPN.
- Nakamura, Robert T & Frank Smallwood. 1980. *The Politics of Policy Implementation*. New York : St. Martin's Press.
- Nugroho, Riant. 2014. *Public Policy : Dinamika Kebijakan-Analisis Kebijakan- Manajemen Kebijakan*, Jakarta: PT. Gramedia.
- Pfeffermann, Guy. 2000. *Path Out of Poverty. The Role of Private Enterprise in Developing Countries*. Washington,D.C.: International Finance Cooperation.
- Putra, D, Dimas & Rudito, Bambang. 2015. *Planning Community Development Program of Limbangan Traditional Market Revitalization with Social Mapping*. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Sciences* 169 .
- Sayuti, Hendri. 2013. *Hakikat Affirmative Action dalam Hukum Indonesia ; Ikhtiar Pemberdayaan yang Terpinggirkan*. Diakses pada 27 Juli 2017 pada : ejournal.uin-suska.ac.id/index.php/Menara/article/view/409.
- Steers, M Richard. 1985. *Efektivitas Organisasi Perusahaan*. Jakarta: Erlangga.
- Subarsono, AG. 2013. *Analisa Kebijakan Publik ; Konsep, Teori dan Aplikasi*. Yogyakarta : Pustaka Pelajar.
- Sumardi. 2012. *Optimalisasi Implementasi Kebijakan Otonomi Khusus Dalam Mendukung Ketahanan Wilayah Di Kabupaten Aceh Utara*. *Jurnal Ketahanan Nasional*. Vol 3. Universitas Gajah Mada.
- Susilo, Agus, dkk. 2010. *Dampak Keberadaan Pasar Modern Terhadap Usaha Ritel Koperasi/Waserda dan Pasar Tradisional*. *Jurnal Fakultas Ekonomi*. Universitas Muria Kudus.
- Toroby, Posumah J.H, & Tulusan F M. 2014. *Efektivitas Pelaksanaan Kebijakan Otonomi Khusus Dalam Rangka Meningkatkan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Di Distrik jayapura Utara Kota Jayapura*. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik* Vol 2, No 3 .
- Winarno. 2014. *Kebijakan Publik : Teori, Proses, dan Studi Kasus*, Yogyakarta : Center Of Academic Publishing Service.
- Website document:
Undang-Undang Nomor 22 Tahun 1999 Tentang Pemerintahan Daerah.

Undang-Undang Nomor 21 Tahun 2001 Tentang Otonomi Khusus Bagi Provinsi Papua. Intruksi Bupati Jayawijaya Nomor 01 Tahun 2014 tentang Pemanfaatan Pasar Tradisional Potikelek dan Penertiban Pedagang yang berjualan di Pinggir Jalan.

Website :

<http://bisniskeuangan.kompas.com/read/2016/09/17/223208426/menkop.pasar.tradisional.tulang.punggung.ekonomi.indonesia> (diakses pada 3 September 2016)

http://www.kppu.go.id/docs/Positioning_Paper/ritel.pdf (diakses pada 3 September 2016)

<http://www.kemenkeu.go.id/sites/default/files/MengukurInklusif.pdf> (diakses pada 5 September 2016)

https://id.wikipedia.org/wiki/Kabupaten_Jayawijaya (diakses pada 3 September 2016)

<https://www.pasificpos.com/lintas-papua/662-pasar-tradisional-mama-mama-papua-akhirnya-diresmikan> (diakses pada 4 September 2016)

<http://jayawijaya.org/bupati-kabupaten-jayawijaya-resmikan-pasar-tradisional-oap> (diakses pada 4 September 2016)

<https://papedapapua.wordpress.com/2015/04/01/keberadaan-pendatang-akan-meningkatkan-daya-saing-orang-asli-papua> (diakses pada 7 September 2016)

<http://www.papualives.com/potret-dominasi-pengusaha-non-papua-di-papua> (diakses pada 05 Januari 2017)