

**ECONOMICS***Sociology*

Seda, F. S., Setyawati, L., Pera, Y. H. T., Febriani, R., & Pebriansyah (2018). Social Policies, Social Exclusion & Social Well-Being in Southeast Asia: A Case Study of Papua, Indonesia. *Economics and Sociology*, 11(3), 147-160.  
doi:10.14254/2071-789X.2018/11-3/9

## SOCIAL POLICIES, SOCIAL EXCLUSION & SOCIAL WELL- BEING IN SOUTHEAST ASIA: A CASE STUDY OF PAPUA, INDONESIA

**Francisia SSE Seda,**  
*Faculty of Social and Political  
Science, University of Indonesia  
Email: Saveria09@gmail.com*

**Lugina Setyawati,**  
*Faculty of Social and Political  
Science, University of Indonesia  
Email:  
Lugina.setyawati@gmail.com*

**Yosef Hilarius Timu Pera,**  
*Faculty of Social and Political  
Science,  
University of Indonesia  
Email: Yoseph.Yerus@gmail.com*

**Rika Febriani,**  
*Faculty of Social and Political  
Science, University of Indonesia  
Email:  
Febriani.febriani@gmail.com*

**Pebriansyah,**  
*Faculty of Social and Political  
Science,  
University of Indonesia  
Email: Pebriansyah@hotmail.com*

*Received: February, 2018  
1st Revision: April, 2018  
Accepted: August, 2018*

DOI: 10.14254/2071-  
789X.2018/11-3/9

**JEL Classification:** D60

**ABSTRACT.** The relations between social policies, social exclusion, and social well-being in the Southeast Asia focusing on the case study of Papua, Indonesia is the main topic of this paper. The data discusses objective and subjective well-being. Both indicators can reflect the social well-being conditions of the region, and indicate the scale of social exclusion in the society of the studied area. West Papua is located in the Eastern Indonesia, and selection of this province as a case study is based on the consideration that welfare of the Eastern Indonesians can illustrate disparities in Indonesia overall. The data presented on West Papua province demonstrates the interrelationship between social policy, social exclusion, and social well-being taking place in this community. Social and economic policies in this context include two levels – that of the National Government and of the Provincial Government. The presented case study provides insights on Eastern Indonesia, which is experiencing more disparities as compared to other parts of Indonesia, while the discussion on the case study is linked to a more general context - that of other Southeast Asian countries.

**Keywords:** social policies, social exclusion, social well-being, objective well-being, subjective well-being, Papua, Indonesia

## Introduction

This paper examines the relations between social policies, social exclusion, and social well-being in Southeast Asia by focusing on the case study of Papua, Indonesia. Social exclusion is a complex concept. It helps understanding the implications of social policy on social wellbeing – at both individual and societal levels. Many studies on social exclusion associate this concept with economic development, and also poverty and socioeconomic disparities (Atkinson, 1998; Bhalla & Lapeyre, 2004; Sen, 1997; Saunders, 1990; Marlier & Atkinson, 2010; Veltmeyer, 2002). This is due to the fact that measurements based objective indicators of economic development are much easier as compared to subjective indicators. Therefore, objective indicators of social well-being are more widely used, such as the HDI score. The Happiness Index as a subjective wellbeing indicator is still limited in use while discussing social exclusion and social policy. This paper discusses how HDI and the happiness index as a universal international tool for measuring the status of a country's welfare are in fact influenced by various factors. Accordingly, positioning social wellbeing in relation to social exclusion needs to be considered in both local and national contexts. In Indonesian context overall, since this country has a heterogeneous society in terms of geographical, ethnic and socioeconomic backgrounds, the scores of Indonesia's HDI and happiness index do not necessarily reflect the status and the condition of each region. By discussing social well-being in the province in Papua, this paper aims to address these complexities more specifically.

The provinces of Papua and West Papua are experiencing serious issues with human development, as compared to other provinces in Indonesia. While Papua has an abundance of natural resources, these provinces have the lowest Human Development Index among all the provinces of Indonesia<sup>1</sup>. In 2016, HDI in Papua was 58.05, West Papua's HDI was 62.21, as compared to the national HDI of 70.18. In fact, prior 2003, these two provinces used to be one province called Irian Jaya. As an autonomous province, West Papua experienced better economic growth than the province of Papua. This paper focuses on the province of West Papua due to several considerations, among others, this province is economically a strategic province due to the abundance of economic resources. The resources come mainly from the mining (LNG) industry and also from the tourism sector. In addition, this province has been granted a special autonomy status which implicates wider access and authority in managing its own economic, political and cultural resources<sup>2</sup>.

In general, human development in Indonesia has been experiencing much progress in the last quarter century, which is visible in various sectors. The national HDI rate went up from “moderate” to “high” (BPS, 2016). However, this achievement is not universal, in the sense that there are disparities between the socioeconomic classes, between ethnic and racial groups; also between urban and rural population, between males and females. Many individuals remain incapable of maximising their potential in life due to their disconnection in various dimensions of human development.

HDI is a measurement introduced by the UNDP, and it has three dimensions: first, long and healthy life; second, access to education, and third, decent standard of living. However, in its implementation, the measurement of life quality has various indicators and interconnected variables. As a result, a universal measurement must be approached critically and sensitively, taking into account the country's history and traditions. This results in differences while measuring the quality of life between the states, and between the regions in Indonesia, being particular, historically and culturally contextual.

---

<sup>1</sup>Berita Resmi Statistik, Papuan Province BPS No. 25/05/94. Year II, 2 May 2017

<sup>2</sup>In Indonesia, Special Autonomy Status is granted to Papua dan the province of Aceh, in Sumatra.

This paper consists of three themes. First, the theoretical framework of this paper is presented. This section elaborates three main concepts discussed in the paper, namely, social policy, social exclusion and social wellbeing. The first theme focuses on discussing education as an important element of HDI in Indonesia. For this matter, secondary data has been taken from various resources. This section also reviews the position of the West Papua province in the context of Indonesia, especially in terms of social welfare. The second theme concerns objective and subjective wellbeing. By referring to the case of Bintuni, a district in the province of West Papua, the discussion demonstrates the complexity of relations between objective and subjective wellbeing. Finally, the discussion focuses on the positioning of Indonesia in the context of other SEA countries. By discussing three contextual levels - local, national and regional - this paper aims to show the complexity of social wellbeing and social exclusion as social realities.

## 2. Literature review

The literature on social exclusion give different interpretations of this specific processes. There are three different interpretations within discussions on social exclusion (Levitas 2005). First, RED (the redistributionist discourse) which is concerned primarily with people living in poverty and the social forces that make this happen. Only through the redistribution of wealth across society as a whole will poverty and inequality be eradicated. This implied that it is not individuals who have to be changed if there will be improvement in the social welfare of society.

Second, MUD (the moral underclass discourse) which concentrates on individual delinquencies and problems in individual attitudes and morality. Proponents extend this argument to social groups. It is also a gendered discourse in the context of highlighting moral weaknesses in which gender has a highly significant role. Thus there is an 'underclass' in society that has become detached from mainstream social institutions, adopts anti-social behavior and has values to justify it. Third, SID (the social integrationist discourse) which focuses primarily on paid work and entrance into the labor market as means to achieve a cohesive society. This implies that social exclusion is analogous with exclusion from the labor market.

In addition to these various interpretations, there are also different definition of social exclusion. This research will follow the general definition suggested by Pierson (Pierson 2010) in which social exclusion means that it is a process over a long time that deprives and individuals and families, groups and neighborhoods of the resources required for active participation in the social, economic and political activity of society as a whole. The causal factors are poverty, low income, discrimination, low educational attainment and depleted environments. The impact of social exclusion is that certain people or groups of people are cut off for a long time from institutions and services, social networks and developmental opportunities that the great majority of society enjoys.

In general, there are four elements in social exclusion (Atkinson, 1998):

1. Multiple Deprivation: not only financially poor and unemployed, but also includes not being able to interact socially and not having a community
2. Relativity: shows the people who were excluded from the community at a specific time and location
3. Agency: where people or agents experience exclusion both voluntary and involuntary
4. Dynamics: where people can be unemployed, experience financial pressure, or a reduced opportunity of becoming more prosperous in the future

The operational definition of social exclusion includes five forces that encourage the process of social exclusion, namely, first, poverty and low income; Second, lack of access to

the labor market; Third, weakness or lack of social support and social networks; Fourth, effect of neighborhood and living environment; Fifth, disconnected from services. The five forces exclude individuals or groups of people (Pierson, 2002).

Previous researches on wellbeing has shown that there is an overlapping between Society, Social Wellbeing, and Social Quality (Hearan Koo, et.al., September 2016). Specifically, the definition of Social Wellbeing is viewed as a combination of the perception of individual life conditions, their quality of relationship with others, and the conditions of society they live in (Ibid., Hearan Koo, et.al., September 2016). There are three dimensions, personal, relational, and societal wellbeing. Personal wellbeing is at individual level (micro level), relational wellbeing is at group level (micro level and meso level), and societal wellbeing is at structural level (macro level).

Social Quality is important to Social Wellbeing because it forms the perceived conditions of society where people interacts with each other. Social Quality indicates that Society requires four conditional factors; socio economic security, social cohesion, social inclusion, and social empowerment. In this Social Quality framework, people have their own specific life experiences which constitutes Social Wellbeing (Op.Cit., Hearan Koo, et.al., September 2016).

### **3. Methodology**

This paper applies a quantitative analysis on data findings. There are two different data sets which are being used in this paper: Primary datas are taken from LabSosio UI primary survey data taken in year 2015. Secondary datas are taken from various statistical reports from Indonesian and International context.

### **4. Conducting research and results**

#### ***HDI of Papua and Indonesia: Education as an Effort to Increase Individual Capability***

Social opportunities in the form of education and health facilities can facilitate economic participation (Sen, 2000; p. 11). The fulfilment of economic facilities can help to generate personal abundance, as well as public resources for social facilities. Conversely, the deprivation of individual capabilities is closely related to low income. The relations can be explained through: first, low income is a major reason for illiteracy and poor health, as well as hunger and malnutrition, and second, better education and health can help increase income. As a result, deprivation of income and deprivation of capability are closely related (Sen, 2000; pp. 19-20). It is also important to avoid rigidly thinking that one of the variables can somehow explain the other. According to Sen, it is better to pay more attention at the policy point of view rather than the two sets of variables that only correspond marginally.

If attention is shifted from lack of income to capability deprivation, one can better understand the experience of poverty and freedoms in terms of a different informational framework (involving statistics that are rarely used as reference points for policy analysis). The role of income and wealth – along with other influences – must be integrated into the broader and fuller picture of human success and deprivation (Sen, 2000, p. 20).

The developmental challenge experienced by Papua is a combination of poor governance and lack of capacity to provide even basic services, and the socio-political as well as historical contexts that continue to weaken development in the region (UNDP 2013). Thus, when examined further, what education policy could strengthen human capabilities? If deprivation in the economic sector can impact other sectors, an appropriate policy should target empowerment that could set out the foundations for individuals to become happy.

Education is one of the experiences that allow humanity to form a good conception of life: reasoning, choosing and taking action. It is thus important to observe the relations of education that train human awareness and other dimensions of quality of life (health, income, social relations, involvement in social and political life). Indicators of education that are currently implemented in Indonesia are input based, such as rate of school registration, and school budget and resources; and output based, such as rate of graduation, years in school and standard test-based measurements such as literacy and numeracy tests.

The issue lies in the current education indicators not developed to measure individual capabilities, but intended for education policies in the stricter sense. In fact, school activities are but one of the various inputs that result in knowledge, skills development and improvement in quality of life. Thus, the issue lies not in lack of detailed information about education, but lack of data measuring education and other important outcomes for quality of life at the individual level.

### *Positioning West Papua in the Indonesian context*

Based on official statistics from the Government of Indonesia, the Human Development Index of West Papua Province in 2015-2016 is ranked at the bottom, alongside Papua Province. Nevertheless, West Papua province's happiness index is relatively good compared to other provinces in Indonesia. The details of the provincial rankings are as follows:

Table 1. Human Development Index (HDI) and Happiness Index<sup>3</sup> (HI) Based on Province

No	Province	HDI 2015	HDI 2016	HI 2014	HI 2017
1	Aceh	69.45	70.00	67.48	71.96
2	North Sumatra	69.51	70.00	67.65	68.41
3	West Sumatra	69.98	70.72	66.79	70.02
4	Riau	70.84	71.20	68.85	71.89
5	Jambi	68.89	69.62	71.10	70.45
6	South Sumatra	67.46	68.24	67.76	71.98
7	Bengkulu	68.59	69.33	67.43	70.61
8	Lampung	66.95	67.65	67.92	69.51
9	Bangka-Belitung	69.05	69.55	68.45	71.75
10	Riau Archipelago	73.75	73.99	72.42	73.11
11	DKI Jakarta	78.99	79.60	69.21	71.33
12	West Java	69.50	70.05	67.66	69.58
13	Central Java	69.49	69.98	67.81	70.92
14	East Java	68.95	69.74	68.70	70.77
15	DI Yogyakarta	77.59	78.38	70.77	72.93
16	Banten	70.27	70.96	68.24	69.83
17	Bali	73.27	73.65	68.46	72.48
18	West Nusa Tenggara	65.19	65.81	69.28	70.70
19	East Nusa Tenggara	62.67	63.13	66.22	68.98
20	West Kalimantan	65.59	65.88	68.40	70.08
21	Central Kalimantan	68.53	69.13	70.01	70.85

<sup>3</sup>The data for Indonesia's happiness index by province consist of the results of censuses published in 2014 and 2017. The happiness index of 2014 is based on the dimensions of life satisfaction, while the happiness index of 2017 is measured using the dimensions of Life Satisfaction, Feeling and Meaning of Life (*Eudaimonia*)

22	South Kalimantan	68.38	69.05	70.11	71.99
23	East Kalimantan	74.17	74.59	71.45	73.57
24	North Kalimantan	68.76	69.20	-	73.33
25	North Sulawesi	70.39	71.05	70.79	73.69
26	Central Sulawesi	66.76	67.47	67.92	71.98
27	South Sulawesi	69.15	69.76	69.80	71.99
28	Southeast Sulawesi	68.75	69.31	68.66	71.22
29	Gorontalo	65.86	66.29	69.28	73.19
30	West Sulawesi	62.96	63.60	67.86	70.02
31	Maluku	67.05	67.60	72.12	73.77
32	North Maluku	65.91	66.63	70.55	75.68
33	West Papua	<b>61.73</b>	<b>62.21</b>	<b>70.45</b>	<b>71.73</b>
34	Papua	57.25	58.05	60.97	67.52
	Indonesia	<b>69.55</b>	<b>70.18</b>	<b>68.28</b>	<b>70.69</b>

Sources: *Central Agency on Statistic 2017* and *Official Statistic Report*, Year 2015 and 2017

The figures of West Papua in the national statistics show a tendency that tends to be similar to the survey results obtained in southern and northern Bintuni as described in the previous section, namely that although the Human Development Index of West Papua occupies the second lowest position (above Papua province) in Indonesia, based on the score of happiness index, in the same period, the province scores relatively good compared to other provinces, namely ranked 8 out of 34 in 2014 and 17 of 34 provinces in 2017. Even the position of this province is better than DKI Jakarta, which is ranked first based in the Human Development Index score. Thus the objective welfare indicators shown by the HDI score are not automatically proportional to the subjective indicators as indicated by the happiness index score. This is different from the general trend at the national level where higher education is an HDI indicator, corresponding to the higher happiness index. The same trend is shown for the relationship between the income of the household and the happiness index (BPS, 2017). The happiness index as an indicator of subjective well-being in this case is also an indicator of social well-being.

### ***Objective and Subjective Well-Being in West Papua***

Several factors may explain the asymmetric relationship between objective and subjective well-being indicators shown in the West Papua case in the aforementioned Indonesian context. First, West Papua was declared an autonomous province in 2007. The status as a province significantly provides opportunities and advantages due to greater autonomy to manage its own area, including finances and access to economic and political resources. Facilities and infrastructure of education, health and others are being built to provide convenience for the population. In addition, the rich natural resources possessed by West Papua has succeeded in stimulating the activity of the economic sector, which contributes to regional growth and income. In particular, economic developments attract migrants from outside the province, who in turn foster the development of various economic sectors in West Papua.

Secondly, West Papua as a province obtains a Special Autonomy status, which implies considerable regional authority, not only economic and political, but also social and cultural sectors. Thus, through this status, the indigenous peoples in West Papua gain better status and position than when the region was still a regency. Special autonomy in Indonesia gives political and cultural special rights to indigenous peoples, through the granting of rights and access to various economic and political resources. Both of these factors contribute to the individual's

perception of life satisfaction. The social, economic and political contexts in the autonomy era are felt to provide satisfaction over previous living conditions. However, based on objective welfare indicators, the change requires a long time. Changes in education still take time. In addition, the economic growth of West Papua that attracts many migrants poses challenges to indigenous peoples, whose skills and educational levels tend to be lower than newcomers. Therefore, based on objective measurements used for the measurement of the Human Development Index, the welfare conditions of West Papuans are lower than in other provinces.

Reflecting on the condition and objective well-being status of West Papua in this discussion, it can be said that there is a gap between West Papua and other provinces in Indonesia, especially in western Indonesia, which is shown by low HDI score. However, the subjective well-being of the population indicated through the perception of life satisfaction as measured in the happiness index indicates that conditions are better than in the rest of Indonesia. This case shows that subjective welfare indicators are strongly influenced by the social, economic and political context of the community, as they reflect how individuals position themselves in their communities. Therefore, the social and economic policies applied at the local and national levels need to effectively bridge the needs of objective and subjective well-being. This finding underscores the complexity of the relationships between social and economic policies, social exclusion and social well-being.

### ***Objective-Subjective Well-Being and Social Exclusion: The case of Bintuni***

The concept of well-being has various definitions as an aggregate of satisfaction of individuals, and thus this concept refers to the situation of a community or the public in general. According to Law No. 11 of 2009, social well-being is a condition of fulfilment of material, spiritual and social needs of citizens, to be able to live adequately and to develop themselves, in order to be able to conduct their social functions. According to the Central Statistical Agency (2000), several of the indicators of social well-being are: (1) family income level; (2) composition of household spending, by comparing spending for food and non-food; (3) family education level; (4) family health level; and (5) condition of housing and facilities owned by the household. This article observes well-being objectively, based on the Human Development Index (HDI) developed by UNDP and consisting of three indicators; and also, the subjective well-being condition according to the perceptions of the respondents towards several aspects related to their well-being.

### ***Objective Well-Being Index using the Human Development Index (HDI)***

HDI is developed to measure the achievement human development based on a number of fundamental components of life quality. HDI is measured based on data that reflect four components, namely 1) life expectancy, representing health; 2) literacy rate and length of schooling, measuring achievement of development of education, and 3) people's purchasing power of a number of basic commodities, measured by the average expenses per capita as an approach to income, that represents achievement of development of adequate livelihood. The following table shows the HDI for the northern and southern parts of Bintuni Bay:

Table 2. Comparison of Human Development Index (HDI) of Southern and Northern Bintuni 2015

Cluster	Literacy rate (percent)	Average years of schooling	Consumption per capita (thousands/month)	Life expectancy (years)	HDI
Southern Bintuni	94.79	8.98	540.4	42.57	<b>53.61</b>
Northern Bintuni	88.42	6.40	500.6	49.01	<b>50.30</b>

Source: *Processed from LabSosio UI primary survey data, 2015*

The southern part of Bintuni has a higher HDI compared to the northern part. The index corresponds to the conditions of economy, education and health in Bintuni. The southern part of Bintuni, which is becoming more open due to the presence of several companies and the administrative boundaries rearrangement, is becoming more progressive in these well-being aspects compared to the other clusters.

Northern Bintuni is the area with the lowest level of well-being. This is predictable, as two of the three components of HDI, namely education index and health index, are lower than in Southern Bintuni. The conditions of education and economy in the residential areas in Northern Bintuni are indeed poor. These are affected by 1) difficult and costly access, for people and goods; and 2) lack of investment (corporations) that catalyse the local economic development.

Table 3. Human Development Index (HDI) by Status of Residence

Status of Residence	Literacy rate (percent)	Average years of schooling	Consumption per capita (thousands/month)	Life expectancy (years)	HDI
Indigenous Papuan	91.04	7.25	434.3	46.59	<b>44.24</b>
Migrant Papuan	91.98	8.52	474.6	33.21	<b>41.56</b>
Non-Papuan	96.09	9.25	614.5	41.57	<b>60.17</b>

Source: *Processed from LabSosio UI primary survey data, 2015*

Based on status of residence, it is observable that the Migrant Papuan group has the lowest human development index. Once again, though, this needs to be interpreted carefully, especially in the component of life expectancy in HDI. Two other components, education and economy consistently show that the lowest values are seen in the Indigenous Papuan group, where they have 1) low awareness of education; and 2) low capacity of agriculture and trade; etc.

### ***Perception-Based Subjective Well-Being Index***

While objectively the people of northern Bintuni have a lower level of well-being, they tend to be happier and have a positive outlook of their condition, compared to the people in southern Bintuni.

Table 4. Subjective Well-Being Index of Southern and Northern Bintuni, 2015

Cluster	Education Index	Economic Index	Health Index	Well-Being Index (Average)
Southern Bintuni	84.76	75.60	83.53	<b>81.29</b>
Northern Bintuni	91.02	83.94	88.58	<b>87.84</b>

Source: *Processed from LabSosio UI primary survey data, 2015*

Subjectively, respondents' perceptions show that the Northern Bintuni cluster has the higher index, as measured by the average of the three indicators (education, economy and health). How could it be, when objectively their condition is the poorer? Although more backwards in many sectors than southern Bintuni, according to the local population, the condition has shown improvement over the past few years. Particularly because of the reorganization (*pemekaran*) of the villages, which led to an increasing number of local government programs received by the villagers, as well as company attention that consistently empower and assist communities in the villages in Northern Bintuni in the areas of health, education, and, of course, economy.

Table 5. Subjective Well-Being Index by Status of Residence

Cluster	Education Index	Economic Index	Health Index	Well-Being Index (Average)	Well-Being Index (P17)
Indigenous Papuan	87.08	79.11	82.85	83.01	83.48
Migrant Papuan	85.14	79.66	83.67	82.82	82.63
Non-Papuan	84.38	77.19	82.81	81.46	80.29

Source: *Processed from LabSosio UI primary survey data, 2015*

The calculation of subjective well-being index presented in the table above also shows the Indigenous Papuan group to have the highest index compared to other groups. Similar to the above explanation, although still lagging behind migrants in the aspects of education, economy and health, the condition of the Indigenous Papuan population in these three aspects has continued to improve over the past few years. This is mainly because of the opening of the region (related to village status reorganization) as well as government and corporation assistance and aid that prioritize the indigenous population.

### ***Well-Being and Social Exclusion: Vulnerable Groups in the Case of West Papua***

The link between social exclusion and well-being can be explained through the terminology of 'vulnerable groups'. In other words, the vulnerable groups are excluded from the development policies of the local government, as well as the community empowerment programs of companies, so that they tend to score lower in the objective conditions of education, economy, and health. Vulnerable groups in general are marginalized and do not have equal access to resources that others can get. Referring to the definition, the vulnerable groups here

are people who lack access to programs and socio-economic benefits of regional development and other party's (such as companies') programs in the Bintuni Bay region. The purpose of both government and corporate programs is to improve the quality of life of the community (especially local indigenous Papuans) in order to prevent disparities compared to other regions of Indonesia.

Under these circumstances, indigenous Papuan communities in Bintuni Bay are severely threatened by high migration rates into the area. With the better human resources and capability to benefit from opportunities, migrants will be more likely to be the ones who enjoy the progress of development outcomes. This reflects a very vulnerable position of indigenous Papuans in Bintuni Bay, who cannot access and optimize the socio-economic programs of the government or the companies. The vulnerable groups are indigenous peoples in Bintuni Bay (especially in the northern part), who do not receive direct benefits from the government or corporate programs.

This section will discuss the interrelations between social policy, social well-being and social exclusion. In the context of a welfare state, an inclusive social policy fundamentally will facilitate and accommodate all citizens as the main beneficiaries of development, in order to achieve an adequate level of well-being, both objectively and subjectively, and at the individual and societal levels. Inclusive social policy will guarantee a low level of social exclusion, both vertical and horizontal. At the same time, an inclusive social policy will guarantee the conditions and quality of social well-being at the personal, relational and societal levels.

Referring to the definition of Koo et al. (2016), 45, social well-being is 'a combination of perception of individual life conditions, their quality of relationship with others, and the conditions of society they live in'. There are three dimensions in the measurement of social well-being, namely personal, relational and societal. Social exclusion refers to a lack of participation in social support, social networks, and access to a wide range of goods and services (Lee & Shrum, 2012). In this study, we specifically refer to the operational definition of social exclusion, which includes five aspects, namely poverty and low income, lack access to labor market, lack of social support and social networks, effects of neighborhood and living environment, and disconnection from services. The analysis in this section will show how the three dimensions of social well-being indicators shown in West Papuan data, reflected in local and national data, can be used to indicate how the policy of social disparities exists (whether it is inclusive or exclusive). The data will also indicate whether social exclusion exists in the society, especially at the vertical level.

### ***Positioning Indonesia in the context of ASEAN countries***

Based on the Human Development Index ranking, Indonesia is in the "medium" category of countries. The trend of the Indonesian HDI is increasing slowly and steadily throughout the 1990-2015 period. Other ASEAN countries that are also experiencing gradual improvement are Brunei Darussalam, Malaysia and Philippines. Other countries experienced a higher increase, especially Vietnam, Laos, Cambodia, Myanmar, Thailand and Singapore. Vietnam, Cambodia and Laos enjoy independence and freedom from political conflicts, and are significantly experiencing increased human development. Among ASEAN countries, it seems that Vietnam and Thailand are progressing most rapidly, marked by the rise in HDI figures. Even Thailand, which in the 1990s was in the same category as Indonesia, has succeeded in entering the High Human Development category.

Table 6. Human Development Index Trends, 1990-2015

HDI Rank	Country	Human Development Index (HDI) Value								
		1990	2000	2010	2011	2012	2013	2013	2014	2015
<b>VERY HIGH HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</b>										
1	Singapore	0,718	0,820	0,911	0,917	0,920	0,922	0,922	0,924	0,925
	Brunei									
2	Darussalam	0,782	0,819	0,846	0,852	0,860	0,863	0,863	0,864	0,865
<b>HIGH HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</b>										
3	Malaysia	0,643	0,725	0,774	0,776	0,779	0,783	0,783	0,787	0,789
4	Thailand	0,574	0,649	0,720	0,729	0,733	0,737	0,737	0,738	0,740
<b>MEDIUM HUMAN DEVELOPMENT</b>										
5	Indonesia	0,528	0,604	0,662	0,669	0,677	0,682	0,682	0,686	0,689
6	Viet Nam	0,477	0,576	0,655	0,662	0,668	0,675	0,675	0,678	0,683
7	Philippines	0,586	0,622	0,669	0,666	0,671	0,676	0,676	0,679	0,682
8	Timor-Leste	..	0,470	0,607	0,618	0,620	0,612	0,612	0,603	0,605
	Lao People's Democratic									
9	Republic	0,397	0,463	0,542	0,554	0,563	0,573	0,573	0,582	0,586
10	Cambodia	0,357	0,412	0,533	0,540	0,546	0,553	0,553	0,558	0,563
11	Myanmar	0,353	0,427	0,526	0,533	0,540	0,547	0,547	0,552	0,556

The graph and table above indicates that the gap in human development indicators among ASEAN countries is quite wide, marked by a large score difference. This is reflected in the HDI scores of Singapore and Brunei Darussalam, which are almost double that of Laos, Cambodia and Myanmar. This reflects the global gap at the regional level.

Table 7. Ranking of Happiness 2012-2014 and 2014-2016

HDI Rank	Country	Index of Happiness Value	Country	HDI Rank	Index of Happiness Value
		2012-2014			2014-2016
24	Singapore	6.798	Singapore	26	6.572
	Brunei Darussalam	-	Brunei Darussalam		-
34	Thailand	6.455	Thailand	32	6.424
61	Malaysia	5.770	Malaysia	42	6.084
74	Indonesia	5.399	Indonesia	81	5.262
75	Viet Nam	5.360	Viet Nam	94	5.074
90	Philippines	5.073	Philippines	72	5.430
	Timor-Leste	-	Timor-Leste		
	Lao People's Democratic		Lao People's Democratic		
99	Republic	4.876	Republic		-
145	Cambodia	3.819	Cambodia	129	4.168
129	Myanmar	4.307	Myanmar	114	4.545

Source: UN, 2017

The graph and table above shows the change in well-being levels, indicated by changes in Indonesia's HDI, is not as fast as most other ASEAN countries. The ineffectiveness of

Indonesia's social and economic policies has contributed to this condition. Especially after the fall of the New Order, Indonesia lacked a comprehensive platform for economic development and welfare programs characterized by constantly changing policy changes along with governmental changes. Consequently, there have been no continuous programs and social policies.

The subjective welfare indicators, indicating the happiness index, show that there is not much difference in the scores of ASEAN countries compared to the objective welfare indicators. Singapore remains in the first position. This figure illustrates a unidirectional relation between objective and subjective well-being indicators. Thus for Singapore, it is assumed that the higher the level of objective well-being, the higher the happiness felt by the citizens.

The data above illustrate that Malaysia and Philippines have significantly raised their index of happiness. While in the 2012-2014 period the Philippines ranked under Indonesia, in 2014-2016, Indonesia actually declined from the 81st position, from 74th. The same situation Indonesia faced was also experienced by Vietnam. The experience of Indonesia and Philippines differ from that of Singapore and Thailand, where improvements in HDI do not linearly lead to an increase in the happiness index.

Based on national and regional exposure, it can be concluded that the relationship between social exclusion, which among others can be indicated through objective welfare indicators (HDI) and subjective welfare indicators (happiness index) is not fixed, but depends on the social, economic and political contexts of the study area. Nonetheless, social policies can contribute to facilitating and bridging these objective and positive indicators of well-being.

## **Conclusion**

In conclusion, the Positioning of Indonesia (Papua) in the context of ASEAN countries is specified on social policy, social well-being and social exclusion – particularly in the West Papua province, Bintuni Regency - consisting of northern and southern. The data discuss objective and subjective well-being. Both indicators can reflect the social well-being conditions of the region, and indicate the presence or absence of social exclusion in the society of the studied area. West Papua is located in eastern Indonesia, and the selection of this province in this paper is based on the consideration that the welfare of eastern Indonesians can illustrate disparities occurring in Indonesia. The eastern Indonesia, especially Papua, is given attention by the Indonesian government, as in many aspects as shown by objective and subjective indicators of well-being, there are stronger indications of disparities, compared to western Indonesia. This is particularly reflected in the social and economic status and condition of the region, which occupy a low position compared to other parts of Indonesia. Therefore, the Government of Indonesia implements affirmative policies for eastern Indonesia, including West Papua.

The exposure of data of West Papua province can outline the interrelationship between social policy, social well-being and social exclusion taking place in the community. The social and economic policies in this context include two levels, namely policies administered by the National Government and the Regional Government (Province). Using the Papuan case, the data and information is used as a representation of eastern Indonesia, which experience more disparities compared to other parts of Indonesia, and through the presentation, the discussion is linked to the context of ASEAN countries.

## Acknowledgements

This paper is presented on the 2<sup>nd</sup> Conference of Social Well-Being Studies in Hanoi, Vietnam, October 12-13, 2017. The Conference Facilitated by the Center for Social Well-Being Studies, Senshu University.

## References

- Atkinson, A. B. (1998). “*Social Exclusion, Poverty and Unemployment*” in *Exclusion, Employment and Opportunity*. Published by Center for Analysis of Social Exclusion, London School of Economics.
- Central Agency on Statistic. (2016). *Human Development Index Based on Provinces*. Jakarta: BPS.
- Central Agency on Statistic. (2017). *Population in Poverty, Percentage of Population in Poverty, and Poverty Line, 1970-2017*. Jakarta: BPS.
- Official Statistical Report. (2017). *Indonesia Happiness No. 79/08*. 15 Agustus 2017
- Official Statistical Report. (2017). *Papuan Province Central Agency on Statistic (BPS) No. 25/05/94*. Year II, 2 May 2017
- Bhalla, A.S. & Frédéric Lapeyre. (2004). *Poverty and Exclusion in, a Global World* (2nd Edition). NY: Palgrave Macmillan
- Central Statistical Agency. (2000). *Ethiopia-Welfare Monitoring Survey 2000-2001*.
- Koo, Hearan, Jaeyeol Yee, Eun Young Nam, & Ee Sun Kim. (2016). “Dimensions of Social Well-being and Determinants in Korea: Personal, Relational, and Societal Aspects,” in *The Senshu Social Well-being Review: Forming a Social Well-being Research Consortium in Asia*, No. 3 (September 2016), pp. 37-58. Published by: Center for Social Well-being Studies, Institute for the Development of Social Intelligence, Senshu University.
- LabSosio UI. (2015). *Primary Survey Data, 2015*
- Lee, J, & Shrum, L, J. (2012). Conspicuous Consumption versus Charitable Behavior in Response to Social Exclusion: A Differential Needs Explanation. *Journal of Consumer Research*.
- Levitas, R. (2005). *The Inclusive Society? Social Exclusion and New Labour*. 2nd Edition. Basingstoke: Macmillan.
- Marlier, Eric, & Atkinson, A. B. (2010). Indicators of Poverty and Social Exclusion in a Global Context. In *Journal of Policy Analysis and Management*, Vol. 29, 2, 285-304.
- Pierson, John. (2002). *Tackling Social Exclusion*. Published by Routledge.
- Pierson, John. (2010). *Tackling Social Exclusion*. 2nd Edition. London: Routledge.
- Sen, Amartya. (2000). *Social Exclusion: Concept, Application, and Scrutiny*. Asian Development Bank.
- Sen, Amartya & James Foster. (1997). *On Economic Inequality (expanded edition)*. NY: Oxford University Press.
- UNDP. (2013). *Human Development Report*. United Nations Development Programme.
- United Nations. (2017). *World Happiness Report*.
- Veltmeyer, H. (2002). Social Exclusion and Models of Development in Latin America. In *Canadian Journal of Latin American and Caribbean Studies*, 27(54), 251-280.

**Appendices**



**Map: Papua and Western Irian Jaya (Currently West Papua)**