

Public Participation in Rural Development Planning

Detha Riristuningsia, Wahyunadi, Iwan Harsono
Postgraduate Program University of Mataram
Email: tuningsiariris@gmail.com

Received: September 7, 2016; Accepted: December 15, 2016; Published: March 2, 2017

Permalink/DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.17977/um002v9i12017p057>

Abstract

This study aims at investigating the level of community participation in a rural development planning (*Musrenbangdes*) in Lapok village, and seeking the factors influencing the level of their participation. It is a qualitative study in which the data are generated through library research, in-depth interviews semi-structured with informants in the field and observations. Informants selected by purposive sampling with the scope of the informants are people who are involved and have a significant influence in the implementation of the Village Planning Forum activities ranging from the preparation, implementation and post-implementation activities. Finding shows the level of community participations in development planning through in the Village Planning Forum in Lopok village is still in the level of apparent (degness of tekonomism). This illustrates that the community involvement in these activities to the extent that new proposals and have no influence and power in determining the final decision. In addition, factors which affect the level of their participation are the low education levels, community work, weak leadership of the village head, lack of socialization and cooperation between communities and village government.

Keywords: Participation, Development Planning, Community Participation, Participatory Planning

JEL Classification: O18, R11

INTRODUCTION

Development orientation involving a public participation contained a sense that people act as a subject, not an object of development. As the subject, the people are encouraged to be actively involved in the development process from planning to implementation and the maintenance as well as the expansion of an outcome of development (Soetrisno, 1995).

The governments, through this way, are more capable of absorbing the public aspirations; as a result, the development implemented can empower and meet the needs of the people (Hope Sr, 2012). Hence, people should become the actors in development, and they themselves need fostering and preparing to be able to formulate their own problems encountered, plan the required steps, implement the plans having been programmed, enjoy the products produced, and preserve the programs having been formulated and implemented.

Society, a subject of development, means that they are exposed directly on policy and development activities. In this case, they need to be involved both in terms of policy formulation and application of such policies. It is due to the fact

that they are considered to be more knowledgeable about the surrounding's conditions. Community participation is an important factor to be considered in order to synergize between the authorities' determination and the public expectations in which it arises not solely on its own, but there are things that are able to influence it, so that people feel aware and encouraged to further engage in all aspects of country life (Rasila & Mudau, 2013; Dewi et al., 2015).

Musrenbangdes is a discussion forum that brings together stakeholders to formulate a development agenda at the village level. The legal basis and implementation of the *Musrenbangdes* refer to the National Development Planning System (SPPN) arranged in SPPN Act (Act No. 25 of 2004). A Village planning is also the foundation of *Musrenbang*, particularly at the village level. In other words, community participation efforts or society participations in the formulation of development plans have been done prior to the Act Village.

Lopok is a village in Lopok district, Sumbawa regency. According to information obtained from the village that many of the Lopok villagers had already been involved in the development processes both from the beginning of the planning processes to the implementation of the programs. It is known from a large number of people attending a discussion forum held by the village. A datum is attached below.

Table 1. Attendant List of Rural Development Plan Meeting (*Musrenbangdes*).

No	Year	Sex	
		Male	Female
1	2014	20	3
2	2015	35	18
3	2016	47	23
Total		102	44

Source: Interview with the head of the village planning board

There is a tendency that the proposals in the real *musrenbangdes* still cannot determine the priority proposal. This phenomenon can be seen from the public protest annually which often emerges commotion because people are not satisfied with the decision of the village in a set of prominent activities. It, therefore, can be stated that the village government still dominates the formulation of the priority activities which will be proposed in the following *musrenbang*. This study aims at to know the overview of the community participation in a village development planning in Lopok Village, Lopok District - Sumbawa Regency and identifying the factors contributing to the level of community participation in the rural development planning in Lopok Village, Lopok District - Sumbawa Regency.

Suroso (2014) researched entitled Factors Affecting Community's Participation in Development Planning in Banjaran Village, Driyorejo Gresik sub-district. The purpose of the research is to see the degree of participation or the power of the community in the decision-making process in *Musrenbangdes*, as well as to determine the factors that influence the people activity. It is a quantitative method with 107 people having been directly involved in the execution of *Musrenbangdes*. The findings showed that the degree of the community participation in the Development Planning through *Musrenbangdes* in

Banjaran village, Driyorejo District - Gresik regency is still up on placation to five of the eight rungs of public participation's Arnstein or still in degrees of tokenism.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Rural Development Planning

Khairuddin (2000: 66) defines a term of development of rural communities or PMD as a process of change which occurred in the village community by looking at the characteristics of the villages, such as the socio-cultural village. Also, several experts, such as Miller (1997); Khairuddin (2000), define the rural development is a term used to describe the approach used to approach the villagers in order to utilize the initiative and local forces more effectively to improve better production and living standards. However Batten (1974); Khairuddin (2000) defines the rural development as a process in which members of the village community firstly discuss and determine their expectations, then plan and work together to meet their wants. Further, Khairuddin (2000: 65) identifies the important things in PMD, namely; (a) PMD is a deliberately process activity; (b) PMD is a togetherness activity of citizens; (c) PMD emphasises more on self-help and community capacity building; and (d) PMD aims to improve the lives of the people concerned.

Meaning of Participation

Community participation can be done at all stages in the development process, from planning and development phases, phases of development, through the utilization stage of development outcomes (Slamet, 1994: 89). Meanwhile, the Eight Rungson Ladders of Citizen Participation can be used to assess the community participation (Arnstein, 1969). Arnstein (1969) in his concept explains the community participation based on the power of communities to determine the final product. Conceptually, the strategy implementation participation is achieved by involving the community in the sharing of information, set goals, setting policy, allocate resources funding sources, operate the program, and distribute benefits, in other words, involving communities from the planning to the implementation and equitable outcome results (Hassan et al., 2011). This aims to know the critical difference between the application of the 'empty ritual' meaning people frequently only invited to a presentation of the planning and was sufficient to be regarded as 'participation' as well as participation in the distribution of real rights and a voice in community participation should be well understood. Thus, to understand the participation from the community in development planning well and clearly, Arnstein (1969) construct a model of participation described as eight pieces of a ladder. Each rung represents the level of public participation is associated with its influence in the determination of a final decision. Each staircase is distinguished by corresponding to the extent of citizens' power in Determining the plan and/or program. Generally, in this model, there are three degrees of participation: a) Non-Participation; b) Degrees of Tokenism; c) Degrees of Citizen's Powers

Table 2 - Level of Participation According to Arnstein:

	Citizen Control	Degree of Citizen Power
7	Delegated Power	
6	Partnership	
5	Palacation	Tokenism
4	Consultation	
3	Information	
2	Theraphy	Non-Participation
1	Manipilation	

Source: Arstein (1969)

Participatory Development Planning Process

Planning activities at a regional level should be directed based on the issues that are relevant to development. They start with the formulation of a common vision and long-term development objectives based on input from the relevant stakeholder groups, so that the vision and mission belong together and a reference for all development actors in the region (Chirenje et al., 2012).

An understanding of the planning process is important to encourage the participation of local governments and in order to have an understanding about the mechanisms and formulations *Musrenbang* process. Although the "Event *Musrenbang*" is not a new thing for all parties at the district level, but the fact shows that, until recently, only 1-5% of the proposals from the results of the village and sub-district *Musrenbang* contained and accommodated in APBD. In other word, the refresh on *Musrenbang* effective participatory process should be carried out before pre-*Musrenbang* begins. Thus, there are common views and needs as well as consistency with a process of real participation.

The basis of this tension is between the initiative and trust occurring over the two (2) conflicts in the implementation framework, which are inherent in the organizational structure and planning process surrounded it. On the one side, it is as the ideology of the relationship measures and local democracy carried out by the movement of "grass root" and the action voluntarily; however, on the other, it is a loyalty to rational planning, and its essence is carried by red tape in the world of government, philanthropy and expertise (Chaskin, 2005).

Factors Influencing the Participation

There are three main factors supporting the realization of the community participation as a real activity; (1) a will, (2) an ability, and (3) an opportunity for people to participate (Sumardjo & Saharudin, 2003). These factors are influenced by many factors surrounding the life of human beings interacting with each other, such as the psychological individual (needs, expectations, motives, reward), education, lack of information, skills, technology, institutional support, structural and social stratification, the local culture as well as regulatory and government services. According to Sumardjo & Saharudin (2003), there are elements that support for certain behavior in a person (Person inner determinants) and there are ads or environmental factors that enable the behavior.

According to Sahidu (1998), the factors affecting the level of willingness of society to participate are the motives, expectations, needs, rewards and control information. Factors which gives people the chance to participate is the setting and service, institutional, structural and social stratification, local culture,

leadership, facilities and infrastructure. While the factors encouraging them to involve are education, capital and experience.

METHOD

This research is a descriptive, qualitative research with the aim to criticize quantitative research (positivism), and to describe, summarize a variety of conditions, situations, or various social phenomena existing within the community that become the object of research, and attempted to pull reality to the surface as a trait, character, nature, fashion, sign or picture of conditions, situation or a particular phenomenon. It uses a purposive sampling technique, and the research site is in the village of Lape Lopok, Lopok sub-district, Sumbawa regency, West Nusa Tenggara-Indonesia.

The type of data in this study is qualitative data in which the data required in the form of statements and policies related to the public participation in Lopok village. The analysis technique used is a qualitatively descriptive analysis. This decipherers, interprets and describes data collected systemically and systematically. To present the more meaningful and understandable data, the interactive model analysis of Miles and Huberman is used in this study.

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Public Participation in Development Planning

Focus on the Community Interest

Each question proposed stated that public participation in the development planning viewed from the dimensions of the focus on community interest has already been quite good. It means that any plan, which will be proposed to enter into RKP village and then it will be poured into *APBDes* and be made a priority in development, is development that focus on people interest in Lopok village. As dictated by Mr. Sahabudin HB, a Lopok village chief, that: "hamlet deliberation, below down to the village known as a village meeting including the *Musrenbangdes*, talks about programs need to be implemented in which they really suit the needs of rural communities" (Interview, 22 August 2016).

Community Involvement

Community involvement in the development planning is an essential key to the success of the development. It is as dictated by Mr. Abdul Arief as the Head of Lopok village, an interview on August 19, 2016, as follow:

"Community involvement is essential because the government will know about what is going on, and what should really be made in the focus of the problem from the society. Substantially, all of which exist in this development was from the people and for the people"

With community involvement in the development process, then the government is no longer applying the Top-Down development system but the Bottom-Up system in which proposals from the community will be an important input in the development effort. The community involvement is an instrument used to view the level of community participation in development planning, which means participatory planning goes well in terms of providing equal opportunity to contribute ideas. The results, obtained from studies conducted to determine the level of community participation in Lopok village, Lopok sub-district Sumbawa

Regency in rural development planning in 2016, show an informant stated that community participation in development planning is already well underway, the community welcomed enthusiastically in the implementation of consultation planning development at the start of the deliberations at the hamlet level involving all elements of society, as stated by Mr. Amirudin as a member of the BPD Lopok Village:

“It is newly implemented in this year that the process of reviewing the state of the village finished remarkable appreciation of the public in participating. In fact, mothers and fathers who were present was incredible that they know and also have outstanding proposals, so we yesterday that the village government, the assessment team and we BPD only do we accept it, we accommodate the incoming proposals, after the last one we made ranks. The ranks 1, 2, 3 become the priority target for 2017. Take a building construction as an example at position 1 and 2, and empowerment in position 3, so complete. (Interview, August 23, 2016)”

Synergy Between the Community and the Village Government

Synergy of the public and the governments means that the cooperation between the community and the village government (Rondinelli, 2003). If a participatory planning runs well between the community and village governments, it will be able to raise the public awareness. It can be inferred that the synergy between the public and the government in the village of Lopok is going pretty well. It is as stated by Mr. Abdul Wahab as community leaders in the village Lopok;

"I observed the synergy has done well enough since there are teams serving to each village to socialize and also to the discussion forum hamlet. Moreover, if it is viewed from the numerous ideas proposed, it indicates that people intentionally want to take a part in the development process in this Lopok village although there are slight disadvantages in terms of proactive efforts to improve society but at the moment as I see, it is good enough (Interview, August 18, 2016).

In spite of being lack in the level of public participation in terms of planning implementation to improve proactive society, the village governments, and the community should improve cooperation and communication each other in order to improve the proactive society. All of this cannot be separated from the public participation to be attend in every development planning in the village as well as the participation of village leaders or team designated to serve. The village governments and the teams are expected to be able to find ways to make people eager to keep attending in every implementation of deliberation. Take more socialization of the importance of public attendance in every implementation of deliberations in Lopok village as an example.

Legality

Development planning mechanisms are stipulated in the regulations of the Regent No. 2 2015 as described previously, but the regulation is still not optimally implemented in the Lopok village. This is due to the fact that the village head, village officials, and the public have lack of ability in understanding the regulation; consequently, the process of development planning in the years prior

to 2016 held by the mechanism which is usually done in previous years, as stated by the Lopok Village Head as follows:

“the mechanism is as the preceding years for musrenbangdes forum; however, for 2016, we started to go down to the villages to gather the aspirations and ideas of the community. I myself have not mastered the Act No. 25, 2004 or the new law, I've read a little bit the neither the regent regulation since I accepted it yesterday from the sub-district, and I think the other village officials have not mastered it too “(interview, August 22, 2016).

There are two factors which internally and externally affect the level of community participation in development planning in Lopok village.

1. Internally, the factors affecting community participation are; first, the average educational level of rural communities is still low. The fact shows that the public often protest in the implementation of the development as a result of having lack understanding of the development processes to the implementation stages. Second, the works of the society, this fact explains that many of the villagers are farmers or ranchers preferring to maintain the fields or care for their animals than attending a meeting in the village, because the classic reason that economic affairs of the family, Third, there is still lack of self-awareness from the communities.
2. Externally, the factors affecting the community participation are: first, Leadership: the head village leadership is still weak. It is due to the fact that the Lopok village head has not been able to embrace the community. Secondly, there is no good communication between the communities and the village head, which means that intensive communication between fellow citizens, between citizens and their leader as well as the social system in a society with a system on the outside have not been able to increase the role and participation of the community, and Third, empowerment in the form of NGOs is still low.

CONCLUSION

From the research conducted, it can be concluded several things about the community participation in development planning as well as the factors influencing the community participation in Lopok village, Lopok District, Sumbawa regency in 2016 are as follows: Musrenbangdes held in the village of Lopok is not just a merely ceremonial meeting, but it actually has been used as a forum for the society to express their aspirations and urgent needs. All proposals brought to Musrenbangdes forum is pure from the people aspirations, neither from the village head willingness nor Village Consultative Body (BPD) which then forced to be approved by the community in Musrenbangdes. The results of the realized development remain in the hands of village government since the village governments understand the village fund, Fund of the Village (ADD) or another budget. Consequently, those such development proposals need to be considered and adapted to the available budget. People attending where participants involved in the hamlet meetings or PKD is each village community either based on self-initiatives or information obtained from the government. The media used to promote the implementation of the Musrenbangdes are invitation. These are done through moving the community or public announcement to the people so that people will know about the widespread holding of Musrenbangdes. Community

participation in village development planning in Lopok village has successfully sought the participation of the communities to the level of the placation on the typology of the Arnstein's participation ladder (1969) or at the level of community participation in the medium category that means the people have already been involved in the process of development, both the planning, implementation, oversight and maintenance of the results of such development, but the authority to approve and prioritize the proposal remains in the hands of the village governments. The level of education, level of communication, types of work, and leadership skills are the factors that influence of the community participation and the most influencing one is the desire of the Lopok rural communities in development planning.

REFERENCES

- Arnstein, S. R. (1969). A Leader of Citizen Participation. *Journal of the American Planning Association*, 35(4), 216-224.
- Batten, T.R. (1974). The Major Issues and Future Direction of Community Development. *Community Development Journal* 9(2), 96–103.
- Chaskin, R. J. (2005). Democracy and Bureaucracy Community Planning Process. *Journal of Planning Education and Research*, 24, 408-419. DOI: 10.1177/0739456X04270467
- Chirenje, L. I., Giliba, R. A., & Musamba, E. B. (2013). Local communities' participation in decision-making processes through planning and budgeting in African countries. *Chinese Journal of Population Resources and Environment*, 11(1), 10-16.
- Dewi, T. C., Witjaksono, M., & Soesilo, Y. H. (2015). Analisis Perilaku Pedagang Pasca Relokasi Pasar Dinoyo ke Merjosari. *Jurnal Ekonomi dan Studi Pembangunan (JESP)*, 7(1), 5-11.
- Erizal, J. (2009). Membangun Momentum Baru Pembangunan Pedesaan di Indonesia. *Jurnal Litbang Pertanian*, 28 (1), 7-14.
- Hassan, G. F., El Hefnawi, A., & El Refaie, M. (2011). Efficiency of participation in planning. *Alexandria Engineering Journal*, 50(2), 203-212.
- Hope Sr, K. R. (2012). Engaging the youth in Kenya: empowerment, education, and employment. *International Journal of Adolescence and Youth*, 17(4), 221-236.
- Khairuddin. (2000). *Pembangunan Masyarakat: Tinjauan Aspek Sosiologi Ekonomi dan Perencanaan*. Yogyakarta: Liberty.
- Miller, H. (1997). Rural Social and Economic Research Center, Central Queensland University.
- Peraturan Bupati No. 2 Tahun 2015. *Tentang Petunjuk Pelaksanaan Musyawarah Perencanaan Pembangunan Desa/Kelurahan*.
- Rasila, B. N., & Mudau, M. J. (2013). Citizen participation in local government: The importance of effective communication in rural development. *International Journal of Community Development*, 1(1), 12-18.
- Rondinelli, D. A. (2003). Partnering for development: Government-private sector cooperation in service provision. *Reinventing government for the twenty-first century: State capacity in a globalizing society*, 219-39.

- Sahidu, A. (1998). *Partisipasi Masyarakat Tani Pengguna Lahan Sawah dalam Pembangunan Pertanian di Daerah Lombok, Nusa Tenggara Barat*. Disertasi. Pascasarjana, IPB.
- Slamet, Y. (1994). *Pembangunan Masyarakat Berwawasan Partisipasi*. Sebelas Maret Universitas Press, Surakarta.
- Soetrisno, L. (1995). *Menuju Masyarakat Partisipatif*. Yogyakarta: Kanisius.
- Sumardjo., & Saharudin. (2003). *Metode-metode Partisipatif dalam Pengembangan Masyarakat*. Jurusan Ilmu-ilmu Sosial Ekonomi Faperta IPB.
- Suroso, H. (2014). *Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Perencanaan Pembangunan di Desa Banjaran Kecamatan Driyorejo Kabupaten Gresik*. Tesis. Program Magister Ilmu Publik, Universitas Brawijaya.
- Undang-Undang No. 25 Tahun 2014 tentang Sistem Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional. Jakarta: Departemen Dalam Negeri.