

# Model Development of Civil Society Participation in Post Implementation of Rural Development Act No. 6, 2014 in Banaran Grogol, District of Sukoharjo

Kristiani

Study Program Education Economic  
Faculty of Teacher Training and Education Sebelas Maret University

Djoko Mursinto

Faculty of Ekonomic and Bussines Airlangga University

Antun Mardiyanta

Faculty of Social and Political Airlangga University

## Abstract

The development which involves a community participation is not easy matter as the regional autonomy becomes the operational concept. In fact, it is not successful yet, regarding to the implementation of regional autonomy which could not bring the prosperity for the poors who live in the village. Therefore, the village autonomy policy is willing to build a village governance based on community participation. The participation becomes an important concept because society is involved as a major subject in the village autonomy. The purpose of this study is to develop an appropriate model of community participation in rural development as an alternative solution to accelerate the achievement of development by the village fund. This research is a case study of community participation in development which conducted in a qualitative approach. The subjects in this study are the board of village institutions and communities in Banaran, Grogol, Sukoharjo district. The analysis process is performed in conjunction with the data collection process from the beginning of the data collection has been sufficiently assessed. The results showed that the typology of community participation in the area of Banaran is not maximized. Therefore, it is necessary to develop new models of typology participation to eliminate the passive typology participation level and replace in the degree of citizens control.

**Keywords:** Community participation model, rural development, Law No 6, 2014.

## INTRODUCTION

### Background of the study

The implementation of authority regulation is a strength for the village governors to administ, regulate and organize his own household. At the same time, it may increase the responsibility and obligation for them. The case of accountability is the management of village funds itself. The common problem which perceived by most of the villages is the lack of financial.

Most of the countries have allocated the budget of development but relatively only involving a few people in the process of composition, Jonathan & Cumhur, (2009). It is also followed by the limited of experts who arrange the budget. Therefore, the need for democratic and responsive policy, also the transparency in the budgeting process and community involvement for the public interest is highly required. Other researchers suggested that, the transparency of the budget will automatically result in increased accountability. There is a growing consensus that fiscal transparency can lead to a greater accountability, yet only in a certain conditions, the transparency could be executed thoroughly but not for the improvement of accountability and public participation, Carter (2013).

If the community is involved in the whole process of development, it would encourage community's sense of ownership toward their development. Moreover, it could reduce the gap between the planned programs with community needs and also could emerge the initiative from the community in accordance with their responsibility and quality control for the programs which are planned before. In the future, the dependency from outsider in decision-making and program formulation could be gradually reduced, as the community independently performed their programms as their own will.

In the new orde, it is very obvious that the government wants to regulate and supervise the village for an extension of power. The Law no. 5 of 1979 is an effective tools to turn down the village's authority. In the reform era, these are apparently existed. The Law no. 22 of 1999 and no. 32 of 2004 are sought to provide a space for the village, yet the national program of empowerment had turned down the implementation of the law for the village.

As the enactment of Law No. 6 of 2014, the village principle of decentralization-residuality has changed into recognition subsidiarity which resulted the flexibility of village authority. The law confirms that the political

commitment and constitutional which protected and empowered by the state is to manage the villages to become powerful, advanced, independent, and democratic, thus, they capable to create a solid foundation in implementing the governance and development towards a prosperous and justice society, (Muluk 2007).

Korten stated that the importance of community participation in various development process could improve the human ethos as stated in the basic idea of people centered developments, Korten (1988). Other experts noted that the importance of community participation in decentralized governments could improve its rate and response to the local needs and development for the poor in rural development, still there are many problem to increase community participation in rural areas, whereas a plenty of participatory approaches could apply in sustainable development, Shakil et al, (2011).

Meanwhile Midgley said that the importance of community participation is a rural development policies which addressed to sustainability in economic, social, and environmental, as the community empowerment and participation give support to rural communities in decision making, strategic planning, providing community infrastructure for community information through the education and training, Midgley (1986). However, Sisoumang et al stated that it is important for the government and community to have a strong commitment in using community resources for rural development and reducing poverty by using the village development funds which guided by rules and procedures and supported through some training, monitoring and evaluation, by community and government, Sisoumang et al, (2013).

Tagarirofa and Chazovochil suggested that to acquire the importance of participation there had to be an evaluation on the efficacy of community participation in rural areas in accordance with the development which involving local communities as an important element in the efforts of success rural development, Tagarirofa and Chazovochil, (2014). While Nepal, (2009), stated that the absence of involvement from local organizations in development planning would resulted in unsatisfactory development results, therefore we need a strategy to improve local organizations to play an active role in rural development. This is an important mechanism to involve the public in rural development. Other experts also noted that to acquire the importance of public participation the evaluation could be testified through A Ladder of Citizen Participation to measure the levels of such participation, Arnstein (1969).

The prove participation of society as a key element of village autonomy remains, yet to show a signs of improvement. Thus, we need an adequate assessment of community participation in development to obtain an alternative resolution which could encourage the acceleration of public participation in Banaran, Grogol, Sukoharjo.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### Regional Autonomy

Regional autonomy is a genuine regulation which not inherently a gift from the government, otherwise, the government is obliged to respect the regional autonomy. As a legal community unit which has the original composition based on privilege, the village could take a legal actions either to be prosecuted or sued in court, whether public law or civil law, and the ownership of wealth and property, Widjaja, (2012: 165).

As the issuance of Law No. 22 of 1999 which was later refined by the issuance of Law No. 32 Year 2004 on Regional Government which provides a strong basis for the village in realizing "Development Community". It claimed that the village is an "Independent community " instead of an administrator or subordinate which its people does not have the right to speak in the interests of the community itself. The village was given the authority to regulate their own regulation independently and coherently in social, politic and economic.

As the independency emerged, it is expected that the participation of rural communities in social and politic development are able to increase. The autonomy which owned by the village is based on its origin and customs, not by the delegation from the government. Taliziduhu Ndraha (1997: 12) described that the village autonomy here as follows: a) regional autonomy is highly admitted, filled, trusted and protected by the government, so that the dependency of the community to the government may be decreased, b) the position and role of village governance is restored, returned to a normal condition or developed to anticipate the future.

### Local government finance

As the enactment of Law No. 6 of 2014 on village, the regulations in the village has changed significantly. In the side of the regulatory, the village is no longer the part of Law No. 32 of 2004 on Regional Government. Essentially, the village law has a vision and engineering which give broad authority to the villages to regulate their own area of village governance, the implementation of rural development, rural community development, and the empowerment of rural communities based on community initiatives, the right of origin, and customs of the village.

The regulation also guarantees that every village will receive funding from the government more than before through the state and local budgets. The funding is highly different from the amount that had been

previously estimated. This policy has the consequences for taking the professional, effective and efficient, and accountable action in the management process based on the principles of good public management and for preventing the risk of irregularities, fraud and corruption. Under the village law, the village treasury would managed four sources of financing. Those are funds from the center both from the district and provincial areas, sources of funding from rural enterprises and other financing sources.

### **Community participation in Rural Development**

Korten explained that the participation was designed by the experts planner from the central and development agencies that run centralistically and hierarchically. It was also bound by the rules which followed by the powers of local functionaries to adapt the program in accordance to the local needs or demands, Korten (1988). The function is to promote the participation at the national level which aimed to ensure economic growth in a trickle down effect on the benefits of development.

Midgley revealed that the direct community participation connotes with the involvement of ordinary people in local affairs, Midgley (1986). Community participation is in the form of community involvement in local affairs directly. It is also clarified that the concept of community participation referred to the one of the definitions which contained in the UN resolution in the early 1970s. The resolution is as follows.

“The creation of opportunities is to enable all members of a community and the larger society to actively contribute and influence the development process and to share equitably in the fruits of development”.

It is the opportunity to create a participation from the community to actively contribute in developing and affecting rural development. Thus, they enjoys the benefits of development equitably. However, Sjahrir stated another definition as follows.

"The understanding of participation in development is not merely in the implementation of programs, plans, and development policy, but also a revolution participation. Therefore, the determination of economic resources allocation is highly dedicated to the people.", Sjahrir, (1988).

As stated by the experts above, the participation in the context of rural development is necessary to construct a more integrated and simple understanding. In fact, the concept will be more easily understood and reviewed thoroughly. Community participation in further rural development could be understood as a direct involvement voluntarily and independently, in the planning and implementation of development activities. It is expected that the sense has covered the decision-making of community participation in the rural areas, especially in the development context.

### **Degree of Community Participation**

A very famous theory to show the levels of participation is proposed by Arnstein, (1969), known as the ladder of participation. This theory categorized participation as a citizen power which affect the change in policy-making. According to this theory, there are three levels of participation which defined into eight rungs of participation. The lowest degree is a non participation. The degree in such participation is actually a distortion of participation which named as manipulation and therapy.

The second degree is showing a sign of participation (tokenism). Public participation in this degree is higher than the previous level. The practice of participation in rural development is the most prevalent on the degree which includes three steps named the provision of information, consultation, and penetration. The degree of activity clearly has involved dialogues with the people. By means the public has the right to be heard eventhough not involved as the decision maker.

The highest degree is the control of people who give a stronger involvement in defining policies. The people is involved either directly in part of decision-making and public services. This degree indicates a redistribution of power from government to the people. There are three ranging from this degree named as partnerships, power delegated and the control of the citizens, as the highest level.

Other experts have acknowledged that the linear conceptualization of participation is significantly emphasized the importance of process. Pretty et al stated that participatory is a shift and focus on the discourse and participation practices, also stated that the assesment and quality of participation impact has shifted not only to promote the participation rate but also to propose a typology of participation which emphasizing the roles and responsibilities of individuals, communities and government agencies in the participation, Pretty et al (1995). These situations are called as a passive participation, participation in the provision of information, participation consultation, participation of material incentives, functional participation, interactive participation, and self-mobilization.

### **Rural Development**

Rural development is a community participation which experienced by society to engage their surrounding to become a local agents of change, Oakley and Marsden (1991). They could only develop their participation level

by involving themselves as the part in decision-making and collaborative activities which could affect their welfare.

Lea and Chaudhri suggested that rural development is a strategy which designed to improve the economic and social life for certain people, especially for the poor, (1983). This supportive argument is followed to extend the benefits of the development for the poor to seek an employment. The strategy to utilize people's participation in rural development is to involve their potential through motivation and organization in rural communities. Rural development aims to improve rural, suburban, and the agrarian population, Burkey, (1993), Kakumba & Nsingo (2008). It deals with a wide range of activities by involving the mobilization of resources in order to empower people to solve all their obstacles and help them to live in a better condition.

## **METHOD**

The observation was conducted in Banaran, Grogol. This study conducted in in- depth and thorough review of public participation in the development of post-implementation of Law No. 6 of 2014. This study is a case study which used a qualitative approach. The subject in this study is the governors, community empowerment corporation(LPM), community leaders and the people in Banaran, Grogol, Sukoharjo district. The informants are subsequently selected by purposive sampling. Therefore, the informants are testified carefully which acknowledged as the key informants based on the author's purpose.

The data collection methods in this study consisted of literature review, in-depth interview, participant observation, and focus group discussion. The analysis process in performed in accordance with the data collection from the beginning up to the data collection has been sufficiently assessed. The process of analysis involved the results of archival, interviews, observation, and focus group or book study conducted by an interactive model. The analysis covered the stages of data collection, data reduction, and data conclusions. The data analysis is conducted during the data collection in the interview. If however the data is not satisfactory enough, the researcher will obtained more credible data.

## **FINDING & DISCUSSION**

### **Overview of Community's Participation in Development Planning Post-Implementation of Regulation No. 6 of 2016 in Banaran.**

Community participation is a community involvement of development planning which involve them to plan the projects in rural development as outlined by local government medium development plan (RPJMDes) , plans for village level development (RKPDes), local government budget (APBDes). The arrangement of APBDes is based on RKPDes as the realization of the development which will be implemented in each financial year as the basic for bupati's regulatory decision letter which considered as a manual and guidelines in the preparation of RPJMDes. The stages or the process in preparing APBDes are as follows

#### **1. Neighborhood Meeting (Pertemuan RT/RW)**

The neighborhood meeting was done in Banaran in accordance with the schedule which carried out each month by inviting citizens in the form of social gathering, to provide information, aspirations, public proposals and determine priorities of rural development. As an interviewee stated in January 26, 2015, "The social gathering is held each month with the community to provide information, problems solving, feedback and suggestions which related to the rural development and neighborhood unit". Another informant from Sanggrahan village which delivered the argument in January 12, 2016 at the village meeting halls Sanggrahan also stated :

"The process of musrenbangdes in Sanggrahan at the level neighborhood is held in the form of meeting to determine development priorities in each region. All of the neighborhood unit have to attended the meetings with no exception. All of them should accommodate all the suggestions, feedback and proposals through the consultation with community involvement based on the urgency and immediateproblem solving in development planning".

Another informant from Sanggrahan village governor in March 14, 2016 at the office of village Sanggrahan revealed "Almost all of the neighborhood unit had their own forum before proposed it to the village. For example, they had it at the first or second week of each month or in tuesday. Therefore, all of the citizens had proposed their ideas and resulted in agreement solution." However, in Cemani, the neighborhood meeting is not held gradually each month, yet the social gathering still manage to be applied as stated by the informant.

"In our area, both of the neighborhood and social meeting are held routinely, but only approximately 40% of people from Cemani which could participate . Perhaps some of them thought that as unnecessary meeting. They thought that their suggestion and demand toward the rural development might never be heard by the governor. Moreover, the chief unit did not know the exact problem. Therefore, the suggestion often to be represented by other village".

This situation also told by the village governor in Cemani that in his village not all of the neighborhood unit held the meeting, or in a percentage is counted approximately only 60%. Thus, the chief unit decided to take his own suggestion instead of held the meeting which could lead to a disagreement and long process.

## 2. Rural development meeting plan (musrenbangdes)

Rural development meeting plan (musrenbangdes) is a system of bottom up process which coordinating the aspiration and participation from the community in determining rural development programmes in a year as a part of democratisation. Musrenbangdes should be held in every and attended by the citizens which include the governor, chief units (RT,RW), chief of family welfare movement (PKK), social organizations, social and religion rolemodel and community empowerment organization (BKM) coordinator.

The involvement of village governor in the process of musrenbangdes is very strong. This statement is acknowledged by the informant as the result of unequal development plan. The development plan is categorized in two different character which called as quality complex and ease simply. Quality complex plan needs the involvement from the experts as the technocrat and lecturers as stated by the village governor in January, 19th 2016 :

“The problem of channelling resulted in the involvement of UNS and UMS in master plan making. Thus, the development could be done perfectly along with the cooperation from the lecture instead of waiting the development done by itself”.

The second could be done by involving community participation. The role of village governor in musrenbangdes could be known by the informants which involved as the participant as follows

“This suggestion from the lower class is frequently high in demand but in a small budget, yet it considered as unpopular suggestion. It resulted in the loss of certain suggestion from another citizens, still though they contribute to prioritize their villages. As the insufficient funds and unequal development plan, there should be a priority of development plan from the citizens. In musrenbangdes, the citizens suggestions is still counted, yet only certain of the programmes that could be implemented and rest of the programme would be proposed in the next year”.

It could be assumed that musrenbangdes involved the community aspiration in decision making in their rural development plan, yet the governor’s role is the most influencing in this process. As stated in data interview by an informant in Banaran, January, 26th 2016.

“As the emerged of numerous and complex suggestions from the community in rural development planning, the governor is still managed to categorize them on their priority. Thus, the filter system should be applied since the insufficient budget. It also done to fulfill all of the citizens aspiration”.

Furthermore, the village funds should be prioritized for physical development. It decided to construct flooding prevention, especially the construction of waterways as the main project. It based on the instructions from regents that the steering and operational committee is formed to hold meetings with the village leaders to determine the priorities. The next step, they should conduct the surveys to determine the locations which will be executed by the construction project.

While in Sanggrahan village, the informant said that the village fund in 2015, is prioritized for the construction of landfill (TPA) as the suggestion from all of the citizens. In fact, it is a crucial problem which should be handled quickly. Moreover, the citizens are frequently throwing garbage along in Konimex road disrupt the environment and public health. While the other informant said in an interview on January 28, 2016, at the office of Banaran that

"Musrenbangdes is formed since no one has responded to the aspirations from the public. Thus, nearly all the village heads are struck to hold the musrenbangdes. Banaran village still held the meeting and invited another villages, yet they never manage to conduct the meeting. They argued that the evidence of none of the programme had implemented, thus, some villages refused to hold the meeting.

The village government felt a high responsibility since all of public proposals were never realized. The practice of musrenbangdes is merely a formality. Since the funds which should be applied in rural development is malfunctioned to the board itself. Thus, the funds is merely a routine activity which allocated to another project. Unfortunately, the village is only a tool to obtain the funds, yet the development could never be existed. As stated by one informant in Cemani village on January 19, 2016.

"In fact, Musrenbangdes should be routinely conducted annually. The thing is the public demand never actualized. It is not like we don't want to hold the meeting, yet the development in rural area never exist. Hence, if the funds were exist there should be a real evidence of the implementation".

“Even the village funds has been allocated, yet the community participation is still low, since the neighborhood unit needs to hold the meeting. Therefore, only certain chief units who routinely held the meeting because some of them thought that the more the meeting is held, the more they resulted in disagreement as example, they frequently too persistent on their opinion which leads to dissatisfaction. Thus, the chief took the initiative to participate on their behalf. Musrenbangdes somehow is useless due to its inefficacy, therefore, the chief units took the participation or reused the same suggestion as proposed last year”.

The village government requested the people includes all the chief units to fill out the suggestion form



in the neighborhood meeting in order to obtain community's proposals to prepare RKPDes and APBDes. This method yet still could not represent all the people's suggestion since they are only in the form of written text which proposed by the chief units. Therefore, the proposals might be suggested only by the chief without any discussion from community. In addition, the previous way to obtain the suggestion in village proposed work plan has not been realized.

### 3. Coordination Meeting

As the follow up from the previous meeting which held in the form of musrenbangdes, a coordination meeting is held and attended by the local figures to determine the affected location in development projects. It resulted that the agreement in physical development will be carried out which include, village kiosk and local infirmary development, multipurpose building, asphalt repairment in the village hall building and the parking lot, embankments Arjuna street, Ngenden river culverts repairment, provide garbages can / landfills in Sanggrahan village, and embankments and river channels repairment in overcoming flooding. For Cemani village, they don't held the coordination meeting because it is enough to hold musrenbangdes in getting feedback from the people.

Community participation in development planning before the implementation of Law No. 6 of 2014 in Banaran is still in a low rate due to the allocation of village funds which received by each village is relatively small and could not be used for physical development in public needs. Most all of the public proposals never been realized, thus people are very reluctant to get involved in the planning. As the enactment of Law No. 6 of 2014 and the existence of village funds, community participation in development planning has been grew, yet not significantly, since they have great expectations of their proposals will be realized.

However, the rural development planning in Banaran has not been fully involve the aspirations of the people and the village government still has the authority to create a development plan without the involvement of local authorities and central government. The local government merely limited to provide guidance and make regulations as well as guidelines and jobdesk as a reference in the preparation of APBDes.

Village is no longer as an administrative level or subordinate regions instead of an "Independent Community" which give its people the right to speak on behalf of the community itself. The village was given the authority to regulate their villages social, political and economic affair independently. Hopefully, this authority is expected to increase the participation communities in social and political development.

The village has the authority and duty to regulate and manage their own affairs and interests of the community based on socio-cultural values that exist in the community to grow development of the village. Government affairs should be based on the origins of the village and the affairs under the authority of the county or city handed over to the village fully. The village held a participatory development planning in which the village spending priorities and executing the budget independently, including managing budgets which obtained directly, Taliziduhu Ndraha (1997).

Therefore, the development planning in Banaran is no longer a part of fiscal federalism which the high concentration of financial only happened in the central government. The form of top down and deconcentration is the appropriate framework for decentralization, the central government can unilaterally determine and change both the expenditure and revenue responsibilities. The local government and another government through the regulation of financial relations could solve any of the problems. The implications of fiscal federalism models are the variety forms of transfers from central government to local governments in order to promote regional economic and local infrastructure. Usually, the local governments will spend the budget in accordance with the guidelines and sectors that have been implemented by the central government.

In addition, a decentralized decision-making process is suitable to be applied in Banaran, as stated by Hayek this process will be simplified by using the information efficiently, Hayek (1945). In the perspective of public finance, local governments have a better and accurate information than the central government, especially on the local conditions, the characteristics and potential existing resources in each region. A complete, valid and accurate information will simplify the local government to take and assign the right decisions in relation to the provision of public goods and services compared to the central government who should take a great decision, including the implementation of development for the benefit of public services and the improvement of public welfare.

Meanwhile, Muluk found that this mechanism is essentially a channel for people to express their aspirations and interests. The more mechanisms of public participation varied the more they had variety ways either in the form of involvement in the process of policy formation, policy implementation or control in government.

### **Typologi of Community Participation in Development**

To obtain a whole understanding about typology of community participation in development, the following discussion seeks to draw conclusions on the exposure of the mechanisms and efficacy of participation as a whole and relate it to the theory of A Typology of Participation states by Pretty, Satterhwaite, Adnan, Nature, Brustnow and Hart. The illustration of typology community participation in Banaran could be viewed table no.1. In this

typology, it appears that there are some mechanisms of community participation in development that could be classified in the degree of non-participation, therefore, not all of the mechanisms are categorized in the typology of participation.

None of the existing participatory mechanisms could be classified in the degree of self-mobilization (mobilization). The mechanisms of non-participation typology by the citizens is still exist in the of community participation in Banaran. The mechanism in RT and RW is still included in the degree of passive typology. However, this mechanisms and coordination meeting is the highest level of participation of society in development. This mechanism occupies sixth typology participation of seven levels of community participation in development typology which developed by Pretty, Satterhwaite, Adnan, Nature and Brustnow, And Hart. None of the mechanisms of community participation in development that are in mobilitasi typology.

Table 1. Typologi of Community Participation in Development in Banaran.

Non-Community Participation	Typologi of Participation	Mechanism of Participation
		Manipulation participation
	Passive participation	Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RT</li> <li>• RW</li> </ul>
Community Participation	Consultation participation	Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Rural development meeting plan (Musrenbangdes)</li> </ul>
	Material/incentive participation	Implementation <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Community Empowerment Organization (LPM)</li> <li>• Communtiy Welfare Movement (PKK)</li> <li>• Community</li> </ul>
	Functional participation	Monitoring <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Commitee (TPK)</li> <li>• Procurement for goods and services</li> </ul>
	Interactive participation	Planning <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• RT</li> <li>• RW</li> <li>• Coordination Meeting</li> <li>• Local consultative house (BPD)</li> </ul>
	Mobilization	

Source: Pretty (1994), Satterhwaite, (1995) Adnan, Alam, Brustnow (1992), and Hart (1992)

Judging from the degree and typology of community participation in Banaran, the interactive participation is the highest. While the lowest degree is typology passive participation which existed in most communities in the village Cemani. It is necessary to develope a new model of participation, to remove passive participation and to increase the control of the citizens which expected to accelerate the development in the village.

Typology of participation in rural development is the most prevalent in this degree. This typology clearly has involved a dialogue with community activity which means that people have the right to be heard, eventhough they are not directly involved in decision making. This stage is known as consultation participation which performed a two-way communication between the authorities and society. Morover, at the stage of musrenbangdes, this is also a suitable level of consultations participation according to both the International Association for Public Participation (IAP2), and Pretty, (1994).

### Development of Participation Model

An insight of various elements from the society stated that the existing mechanisms in Banaran has not been effective since they have not been able to satisfy the stakeholders to provide the tools of participation that enable the community control in the development process. Therefore, a new staircase of participation should provide a space for the achievement of community control in rural development. It is in accordance with the participation stages as in Ladder of Empowerment from Typology of Public Participation in Program and Project Development Pretty`s and Ladder of Participation of Arnstein. The maximum stage of participation plays a prescriptive function such a community control as an idealistic which desired by the stakeholders of rural development.

In addition, the new typology participation should not provide an access for mechanisms of participation which are not regarded as non-participatory. It is not necessary thing since the possibility of participation manipulation seem to be happened in the policy process participation, in fact, the community does

not have the role at all. A synthesis of ladder participation raises a new stages of typology participation than before. The stage of participation typology is certainly suitable with the real condition in rural development. In this new participation typology, there are two levels of participation, the control of citizens and participation. These levels are definitely equal to what have been formulated by Arnstein and Pretty's. The second ladder of typology participation shows that the public has a concern for the projects which are implemented by the village government. Table 2 is a new typology in Banaran

Table 2 The New Participation Typology in Banaran

		Participation Typology		The Possible Participation Mechanism
Community Control		6	Community control	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Coordination meeting</li> <li>▪ Sosialization</li> <li>▪ Coordination meeting</li> </ul>
Participation	High	5	Interactive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Communitys initiative</li> <li>▪ (RT)</li> <li>▪ (RW)</li> <li>▪ LPM</li> <li>▪ Coordination meeting</li> </ul>
	Medium	4	Functional	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Contributor</li> <li>▪ Commitee (TPK)</li> <li>▪ Procurement of goods and services</li> <li>▪ Community Empowerment Organization (LPM)</li> </ul>
		3	Material/Incentive	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Community</li> <li>▪ Manufacture</li> </ul>
		2	Consultation	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Village Meeting</li> <li>▪ Rural development meeting plan (Musrenbangdes)</li> </ul>
		1	Information	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Socialization of Development Information</li> </ul>
Low				

Source: Arnstein, (1971) & Pretty (1994), Satterhwaite, (1995) Adnan, Alam Brustnow (1992), And Hart (1992).

From the table 2, Banaran is in efforts to accelerate the development of a new model of typology community participation. In this typology, there are only two levels, citizen control and participation typology which classified into high, medium and low. Typology control of citizens is the sixth highest typology which expected to gain citizens participation. Because the citizens control is actively involved either directly or indirectly in the development their participation could be increased. Therefore, in afterward, the village government judged the communitys participation is not maximized.

This is caused by the feeling of comfortable enough with their development funds from various sources, both from the village government, local government, the provincial government and from the central government, eventhough the number is limited and can not be evenly distributed. In addition the public trust in government village is way too good in cooperation. Therefore, the village government needs to hold a village consultation meetings periodically to discuss the problems of the village, especially rural development, they should discuss with the community about the crucial need and its solving, also the funds availability.

By doing a simple rating in the theory of mechanism of public participation, the level of community participation of development in Banaran has reached in citizen participation level, yet could not reached the level of citizen control. These results are also in line with what is stated by Timney that "citizen participation almost always fails to approach to the top of Arnstein's ladder, public participation rarely enables citizens to significantly change or influence agency decisions." Timney argued that the community participation is always failing to reach the top of the Arnstein participation, moreover, it rarely to provide the opportunities for citizens to change or influence the village government decisions.

## REFERENCES

- Arnstein, Sherry R. 1971, *Eight Rungs The Iadder of Citizen Participation'* in Edgar S. Cahn and Barry A. Passet. *Citizm Parti.ci.pation: Effecting Community Change*. New York: Praeger Publishers..
- Bogdan & Tylor, 1982, *Introduction to Qualitative Research Methods*, John Wiley & Son. New York.
- Bryant Carolie dan Louise G. White. 1987, *Manajemen Pembangunan Untuk Negara Berkembang*. Translator: Rusyanto L. Simatupang. Jakarta : LP3ES
- Burkey, S. (1993). *People First: Guide to Self-Reliant Participatory Rural development*. New Jersey: Zed Books..
- Carter Becky, 2013. *Budget Accountability and Participation*, Research, Governance, Applied Knowledge Service.
- Choguill, M. B. G. 1996. *A ladder of community participation for underdeveloped countries*. *Habitat International*.
- Conyers, D. 1983 *Decentralization: The Latest Fashion in Development Administration?*, Public Administration and Development, Vol. 3.



- Creswell. W, John, (2013), *Research Design: Pendekatan Kualitatif, Kuantitatif, dan Mixed*, Yogyakarta: Pustaka Pelajar Publisher.
- Dahl, R.A. 1981 *The City in the Future of Democracy*, in L.D. Feldman (ed) *Politics and Government of Urban Canada*, London.
- Government Regulation Number 72 Year 2005 on Village .Jakarta: BP. Restindo Mediatama.
- Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 43 Year 2014 on *Regulations of Law Implementation No. 6 Year 2014 on Village*.
- Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 60 Year 2014 on *Funds*.
- Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 22 Year 2015 On *The Village Fund Sourced From budget revenue and Expenditure*.
- Government Regulation of the Republic of Indonesia Number 47 Year 2015 on *Regulations of Law Implementation No. 6 Year 2014 on Village*.
- Jacob, Togarirofa, dkk. 2014, *Exploring The Politics of Local Participation in Rural Development Projects: Small Dams Rehabilitation Project in Zimbabwe*. Journal of Agricultural and Social Economics Science.
- Justice. B. Jonathan and Dulger Cumhur, (2009), *Fiscal Transparency And Authentic Citizen Participation in Public Budgeting: The Role of Third-Party Intermediation*, Journal of Public Budgeting, Accounting & Financial Management, 21, 254-288.
- Kakumba, U. & Nsingo, S. (2008). *Citizen Participation in Local Government and the Process of Rural Development: The Rhetoric and Reality of Uganda*. *Journal of Public Administration*. Vol. 43. No.2, pp 107-123.
- Kirk J & Miller, 1986, *Qualitative Research*, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publication.
- Kortern, Dayid C, 1986. *Introduction: Community-Based Resource Management*" in David C. Kortern (edl). *Community Managemnt: Asian Erperience and Perspectiues*. West Hartford Connecticut: Kumarian Press.
- Law of Regional Government Number 32 Year 2004 32, Jakarta, Focusmedia, 2011.
- Laws of the Republic Indonesia on Regional Government Number 5 Year 1979.
- Laws of the Republic Indonesia on Regional Government Number 22 Year 1999.
- Laws of the Republic Indonesia Number 25 Year 1999 on *Financial Affairs of Central and Local Government*.
- Laws of the Republic Indonesia on Regional Government Number 32 Year 2004.
- Laws of the Republic Indonesia Number 33 Year 2004 on *Financial Affairs of Central and Local Government*.
- Laws of the Republic Indonesia Number 6 Year 2014 on Villages.
- Lea, A.M & Chaudhri, D.P. (1983). *Rural Development and the State*. New York: Methuen & Co. Ltd.
- Midgley, James. 1986. *"Introduction: Social Developmeng the Sate and Participation"* in James Midgley et al. *Community participation, social development and the safe*. New York: Methuen.
- Miles B. Mathew dan A. Michall Huberman, 1992, *Qualitatif Data Analysis Thousand Oaks*, CA: Sage.
- Moleong, Lexy J, 2014, *Metode Penelitian Kualitatif*, Bandung: Remaja Rosdakarya,
- Muluk, Khairul, 2007, *Menggugat Partisipasi Pulik Dalam Pemerintahan Daerah. (Sebuah Kajian Administrasi Publik dengan Pendekatan Berpikir Sistem)*. Malang: Bayumedia Publishing.
- Musgrave, Richard A, dan Peggy B, Musgrave, 1991, *Keuangan Negara Dalam Teori dan Praktek*, Translator, Alfonsus Sirait, Jakarta: Penerbit Erlangga.
- Nampila, T. (2005). *Assessing Community Participation: The Huidare informal settlement*. Master of Arts thesis: Department of Social Work: University of Stellenbosch.
- Nepal Pashupati, (2009), *Local Organizations: Viable Mechanism For Ensuring Participation In Rural Development*, Journal: Tribhuvan University, Vol, XXVI, No.1.
- Nhlakanipho Sibiyi, 2010, *An Investigation of Community Participation Trends in The Rural Development Process in Nquthu, Northern KwaZulu-Natal*, Faculty of Arts`Departement of Social University of Zululand.
- Obsborne, David and Ted Gaebler, 1992, *Reinventing Government: How the Enterpreneurial Spirit is Transforming the Public Sector*, Mass: Addison Wesley Publishing.
- Oakley, P & Marsden, D. 1984. *Approaches to participation in rural development*. Geneva: International Labour Office Publications.
- Regulation of Minister of Home Affairs No. 37 Year 2007 on Guidelines for Financial Management village.
- Pretty, J, 1995. *Participatory Learning for Sustainable Agriculture World Development*, Vol.23, No.8.
- Rondinelli, D.A. 1990, *Decentralisation, Territorial Power and the State: A Critical Response*, Development and Change, Vol. 21 (pp.491-500).
- Shakil, A Muhammad et al, 2011, *Decentralization and Participation Rural Development*, A. Literatur Review Journal, Contemporary, Economic, Vol 5, Malaysia: Technology University of Malaysia.
- Sjahrir, 1988. *Pembangunan Berdimensi Kerayataan* in David C. Kortern and Sjahrir. *Pembangunan Berdimensi*

- Kerakyatan*. Translator: Setiawan Abadi. Jakarta: YOI.
- Sisoumang Bounthom, et al, (2013), *Operation and Management of The Village Development Fun in Champasak Province, Lao PDR*, Bangkok: Faculty of Economics, Kasetsart University.
- Timney, Mary M. (1998). Overcoming administrative barriers to citizen participation: Citizens as partners, not adversaries. In C. S. King and C. Stivers (Eds.), *234 Government is us: Public administration in an anti-government era* (pp. 88- 101). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Widjaja, 2012, *Otonomi Desa (Merupakan Otonomi Yang asli Bulat dan Utuh)*, Jakarta: Rajawali.
- World Bank, 1999, *Governance and Development*, Oxford Univesity Press Washington DC.