

Community Participation Level of Penggung Village on the Argopolitan Region Development in Kecamatan Bandar Nawangan, Kabupaten Pacitan

Jenvia Rista Pratiwi^{1*}, Rita Parmawati², Ridwan Muhammad Rifai¹

¹Department of Civil Engineering and Planning, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Malang, Malang

²Master Program of Natural Resources Management, Brawijaya University, Malang

Abstract

Pacitan Regency owns abundant natural resources, one of which is in the agricultural sector. In accordance with the RTRW of Pacitan Regency 2005-2025, there is a development plan for the Agropolitan Area in Bandar and Nawangan Sub-districts. This research aims to find out how the level of community participation in the development of the Agropolitan Area of Bandar Nawangan Subdistrict, Pacitan Regency. The descriptive quantitative approach was used to understand how community involvement in Agropolitan Area development planning. The level of community participation was measured using Arnstein's concept (A Ladder of Citizen Participation) and showed the level of community participation at the informing level, which is included in the tokenism classification. This study's results recommended assistance to local leaders to have similar goals as the government as the means of increasing community participation. The village leaders have greater influence or control because of their proximity to the community. As a consequence, community participation in the development of the Agropolitan Area of Bandar Nawangan Sub-district, Pacitan Regency will be escalated.

Keywords: agropolitan, participation level, arnstein

INTRODUCTION

Indonesia, one of the countries possessing great potential in the agricultural sector, has more than 75% of its residents living in villages and working in agriculture. This sector has been considered a major foundation of the country's economic growth. Agropolitan is an example of implementing agriculture in an integrated manner with an emphasis on agriculture, agro-free industry, and rural industry [1]. This concept involves one or more villages in one or more districts (kecamatan) within a regency or city.

Agropolitan has been becoming an emerging development concept sought and implemented by several regencies and cities in Indonesia. This is eventually since agropolitan has provided a d 27.6% contribution for PDRB (regional income) and a d 23.37% employment rate of total Indonesian residents [2]. Agropolitan can become a solution to rural development without disregarding urban areas [3].

Pacitan is a regency that has established agrotourism as a part of the agropolitan area. Based on RTRW (spatial plan) 2005-2025, the agropolitan area is focused in Kecamatan

Nawangan and Kecamatan Bandar. Penggung Village is an example of a potential village within these districts. This village possesses abundant agricultural resources, especially coffee. Almost all villagers have a coffee plantation in their barnyard. The average area occupied by coffee plantations in 2016-2018 was 85 hectares with a production rate of 15.9 tons p.a. [4].

The implementation of the agropolitan programme in Penggung village, Kecamatan Nawangan requires considerable management since this area lies on an arid plateau. The social condition of the farmers depends highly on topography, soil fertility, erosion risk, and education level. Socialisation has been conducted by Pacitan Regency officials to accelerate the agropolitan area development programme. It is critical for villagers to participate in this programme objecting to a sustainable setting can only be achieved if people own responsibility and sense of belonging against the programme. Therefore, this study is relevant to understand community participation levels in socialisation, in conjunction with agropolitan area development.

MATERIAL AND METHOD

This study used a descriptive-quantitative approach with quantitative data against a single variable, where comparison or integration with other variables is neglected. The object of this study was Penggung village residents, considered

Correspondence address:

Jenvia Rista Pratiwi

Email : jenvia.rista.ft@um.ac.id

Address : Jl Semarang No. 5 Malang 65145

as the population, and coffee peasants, industry owners, and non-governmental organization “Guyup Kopi and Kakao”, considered as the sample. Sample number determination was carried out by the Slovin equation [5] as follows.

$$n = \frac{N}{N(d)^2 + 1}$$

where: n = number of samples
 N = number of populations
 d = margin of error (0.1, or 90% of confidence interval)

Data was collected using the survey method via questionnaire disbursement and direct observation. The questionnaire was given to the respondents to be answered and was formulated based on Arnstein’s concept. On the other hand, direct observation was conducted on the research object to obtain more accurate data relevant to the actual condition [5].

Descriptive analysis was used to depict and determine the community participation level by employing Arnstein Ladder analysis tools. The community participation level was calculated by the summarisation of variable scores. This level was then incorporated within eight categories of Arnstein Ladder by classifying the community participation level into three levels i.e., high participation (citizen power), medium participation (tokenism), and low participation (non-participation) [6]. Table 1 below summarises the description.

Table 1. Participation Level Category

No	Level	Arnstein Classification
1	Low (<i>Non-participation</i>)	Manipulation Therapy
2	Medium (<i>Tokenism</i>)	Informing Consultation Placation
3	High (<i>Citizen Power</i>)	Partnership Delegated Power Citizen Control

Source: Permatasari et al., 2018

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

The questionnaire was used to obtain primary data and formulated following the Likert scale covering the measurement of attitude, opinion, and perception of someone or a group of people regarding the social phenomenon. The Likert scale owns gradation from very positive to very negative as can be seen in Table 2 below [7].

Table 2. Scoring based on the Likert scale

Opinion to a Statement	Score
Strongly Agree	5
Agree	4
Neutral	3
Disagree	2
Strongly Disagree	1

Source: Bahrun et.al, 2018

The community participation level can illustrate up to which point, people are willing and contribute to the agropolitan area in Penggung village. This participation was measured following some indicators i.e., socialisation attendance level, socialisation event organisation, community participation in providing ideas or opinions, the response from the government, community involvement in planning determination, transparency in development, community involvement in decision-making, and community who become a conclusive decision-maker. The Likert scale was used to ensure the people’s ease in answering the questionnaire, by categorising the responses into five scales (1-5). The community participation level of Penggung village can be seen in Table 3.

Table 3. The community participation level of Penggung village

Indicator	Answer Scale										Sum	Average
	1		2		3		4		5			
	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%	f	%		
Socialisation attendance level	0	0.00	4	4.08	20	20.41	3	3.06	71	72.45	435	4.44
Socialisation event organisation	13	13.27	10	10.20	75	76.53	0	0.00	0	0.00	258	2.63
Providing ideas or opinions	32	32.65	62	63.27	2	2.04	2	2.04	0	0.00	170	1.73
Responses from government	14	14.29	0	0.00	0	0.00	83	84.69	1	1.02	351	3.58
Involvement in planning determination	62	63.27	2	2.04	21	21.43	13	13.27	0	0.00	181	1.85
Transparency in development	85	86.73	12	12.24	0	0.00	1	1.02	0	0.00	113	1.15
Involvement in decision-making	94	95.92	4	4.08	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	102	1.04
Community as conclusive decision-maker	94	95.92	4	4.08	0	0.00	0	0.00	0	0.00	102	1.04
Total											1,712	-
Average											-	2.81

From the above table, the average score of community participation level can be calculated by multiplying the average score of participation level for whole indicators by the number of respondents. In this case, they were 2.81 and 98, respectively. The generated community participation level score was acquired as 275.38. On the other hand, the total score for community participation was obtained as 1,712.

The total score for the community participation level was then incorporated into the Arnstein typology known as Arnstein Ladder which covers eight levels. The conversion follows a method formulated by Pratiwi (2020) [8], where the total score was divided into eight categories proportionally according to the magnitude of the score. The detail is as follows.

1. Citizen Control, a score between 3,528 – 3,920
2. Delegated Power, a score between 3,136 – 3,527

3. Partnership, a score between 2,744 – 3,135
4. Placation, a score between 2,352 – 2,743
5. Consultation, a score between 1,960 – 2,351
6. Informing, a score between 1,568 – 1,959
7. Therapy, a score between 1,176 – 1,567
8. Manipulation, a score between 784 – 1,175

From the above description, it was observed that the participation level of the community in Penggung village fit into Informing level. In this case, it was understood that information had been apprised by the government without any feedback and negotiation power offered to the community. According to Arnstein (1995) [9], the levelling shows a magnitude difference in participation and power delegation from the government to the community. This is further explained in Table 4.

Table 4. Eight Levels of Community Participation

Participation Level	Fundamental of Participation	Power Delegation Level
1. Manipulation 2. Therapy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Official commitment Authorities dictate the community as a whole 	Non-participation
3. Informing 4. Consultation 5. Placation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Community rights and responsibilities are identified Opinions from the community are perceived but not used Suggestions from the community are received but not always implemented 	Tokenism
6. Partnership 7. Delegated Power 8. Citizen Control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a reciprocating relationship between parties The community is provided with power for some or all programmes 	Citizen power

Source: Arnstein, 1995

The community participation concept emphasises accommodating and providing the community as individuals for influencing public decisions and policies since these individuals are considered in democratic decision-making. It is expected that the concept assists the development plan in becoming more directed where the arranged development plan suits the needs of the community, covering priority determination. Therefore, the implementation of development can be effectively and efficiently executed [10].

Based on previous analysis, it was discovered that the community participation level in Penggung village was Tokenism with the classification level of Information (the third ladder of eight Arnstein ladder). This condition can relate to the insufficient understanding and knowledge of agropolitan and agrotourism. In general, the community was unable to provide the opinions or suggestions needed for the development of the agropolitan area in Penggung village, Pacitan Regency.

The result of this study was in line with a previous study conducted by Khoiroh (2019) [11]

which stated that tokenism participation level is indicated by the presence of communication between government and society. This condition allows society's voices to be perceived, and opinions to be allowed, yet the voices and opinions are not subject to the major consideration of the decision maker (the government). This may be a consequence of one-way communication, where the community can only provide opinions following the request from the government. No feedback session has ever been organised by the government [12].

The Informing level itself is a transition from no participation to tokenism where the two characteristics of both are interspersed. The first characteristic is information disbursement regarding options, roles, and responsibilities of the community which serves as the initial step towards community participation. The second characteristic is one-way information disbursement from the authority to the community without the involvement of feedback from the community [12].

The local regulator aspired to develop the tourism in northern part of Pacitan Regency where the advance was lacking. This is for instance based on the fact that tourism in the northern part of this regency was very limited with inadequate access. Hence, the development of agropolitan and agrotourism may help to accelerate tourism in this area, especially in Kecamatan Bandar and Kecamatan Nawangan, where the object village lies. Until recently, the community of Penggung village has been in the mode of receiving information from the local regulator. Tools used by the government as the regulator to distribute the information include posters, leaflets, newspapers, and direct socialisation.

Meanwhile, socialisation had only been done to the peasants who were associated with the farmer association and village officials. Nonetheless, the rest of the population had never been involved in this occasion. Therefore, socialisation has to be broadened to ensure that information delivery is well accepted by the whole target community. This will establish good cooperation between the government and the community. In addition, topics related to agropolitan had rarely been introduced to the community, making the knowledge on it missing.

Based on a study conducted by [13], the community participation level at the whole programme steps related to "Community-based Residential Design" – PLPBK actually laid in

Informing stage. This confirmed that the information provided by the government to the community was presented one way.

Nevertheless, it is indeed that the community participation level of Penggung village can be enhanced from tokenism to citizen power. This can be achieved in several ways with some effort from the governmental side e.g., providing a more accentuate socialisation in the agropolitan, enhancing people's awareness and involvement in the socialisation or programme, and engaging public figures such as religious and village leaders.

Accordingly, the main factor in improving Penggung village residents' participation level is the leader or village headman. The leader is in possession of full authority in decision-making within his/her dominion. Correspondent to Ardila et al. (2014) [14], a formal leader is a necessity to grow community participation since he/she is responsible to promote and motivate residents to actively participate in a certain programme. This is in line with the village leader's function as a government, development, and social administrator.

The village leader is expected to be able to motivate his/her community, especially who are in association with youth organisations (Karang Taruna). Penggung village owns an active Karang Taruna which has been engaged closely in coffee grind production under the "Topco Asli" industry supervision. In addition, it is possible to establish community groups who are engaged mainly in tourism (in Indonesia is called POKDARWIS). Usually, POKDARWIS consist of educated youth to ensure the information literation can be perceived appropriately. POKDARWIS members can include some of Karang Taruna's active members. These groups are within one's area to assist village development in tourism which eventually increases community participation level in regards to the agropolitan of Penggung village.

CONCLUSION

According to the result of this study, it is concluded that the community participation level of Penggung Village in the frame of the agropolitan area Kecamatan Bandar Nawangan was categorised in Informing stage. The essential indication of this situation is due to the government has only done the socialisation of development for fulfilling the convention within information disbursement. In the participation level, the Informing belongs to tokenism where

the development plan mainly emphasises government participation even though during its practical condition, community participation is not prohibited. Nevertheless, society has no exemption and allowance enough for expressing their ideas, opinions, and needs.

REFERENCES

- [1]. Ahmad, Y., Saad, H., Afgani, E.Y., & Yusof, N. 2018. Economic Impact To Quality of Life of Agropolitan Participants in Malaysia. *Journal of ASIAN Behavioural Studies*, Vol 3. No.8, (57-58)
- [2]. Badan Pusat Statistik. 2020. *Laporan Perekonomian Indonesia 2020*. Badan Pusat Statistik Indonesia. Jakarta
- [3]. Suyatno, Y. 2008. *Penguatan Strategi Pengembangan Kawasan Agropolitan Berbasis Peningkatan Daya Saing Produk Agribisnis Unggulan di Kabupaten Semarang*. Semarang. UNDIP
- [4]. BPS Kabupaten Pacitan. 2019. *Kabupaten Pacitan Dalam Angka 2019*. Citra Mandiri Printing. Pacitan
- [5]. Sugiyono. 2011. *Metode Penelitian Kombinasi (Mixed Methods)*. Alfabeta. Bandung
- [6]. Permatasari, C. J. Astuti, A.M. 2008. *The Effect of Water Fraction of *Stellaria* sp. on the Content of TNF- α in Mice (*Mus musculus* BALB-C)*. Thesis. Department of Biology. University of Brawijaya. Malang. (Thesis)
- [7]. Bahrin, S., Alifah, S., & Mulyono, S. (2018). *Rancang Bangun Sistem Informasi Survey Pemasaran Dan Penjualan Berbasis Web*. *TRANSISTOR Elektro Dan Informatika*, 2(2), 81–88.
- [8]. Pratiwi, Jenvia Rista. 2020. *Pengembangan Argowisata Kebun Kopi di Kawasan Agropolitan Kabupaten Pacitan* (Tesis Magister Universitas Brawijaya). Malang
- [9]. Arnstein, S. R. (1995). *A Ladder of Citizen Participation* dalam Jay M. Stein, (ed) *Classic Reading in Urban Planning: Introduction*, Mc Graw Hill, Inc, New York.
- [10]. Adisasmita, R. 2013. *Teori-teori Pembangunan Ekonomi*. Graha Ilmu. Yogyakarta.
- [11]. Khoiroh, S. F. 2019. *Analisis Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Pengembangan City Branding di Kabupaten Pemalang Jawa Tengah Melalui Pengembangan Pariwisata*. *Jurnal Universitas Diponegoro*.

- <https://ejournal3.undip.ac.id>. Diakses pada 28 November 2021
- [12]. Ulfa, A. N., S. Marwanti dan B. W. Utami. 2013. Persepsi dan Tingkat Partisipasi Petani Terhadap Pengembangan Desa Berbasis Agrowisata (Studi Kasus di Desa Kecamatan Ngargoyoso Kabupaten Karanganyar). *Jurnal Agrista*, Vol. 3, No. 3, (232-238)
- [13]. Makhmudi, D. dan M. Muktiali. 2018. Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Pembangunan Prasarana Lingkungan Pada Program Penataan Lingkungan Permukiman Berbasis Komunitas (PLPBK) di Kelurahan Tambakrejo, Kota Semarang. *Jurnal Pengembangan Kota*, Vol.6, No. 2, (108-117)
- [14]. Ardila, T., M. Makmur, dan I. Hanafi. 2014. Upaya Kepala Desa untuk Meningkatkan Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Pembangunan Desa. *Jurnal Administrasi Publik (JAP)*, Vol. 2, No. 1, (71-77)