

---

## An analysis on public participation in Agrarian Reform program in Jenawi Sub-district of Karanganyar Regency

---

Winarti\* and Suranto J.

Faculty of Social and Political Sciences of Universitas Slamet Riyadi  
Surakarta, Sumpah Pemuda Street No.18, Kadipiro, Banjarsari Sub District,  
Surakarta City, Central Java 57136

Email: winartitik@yahoo.co.id

Email:Jk\_suranto@yahoo.co.id

\*Corresponding author

Widodo. B.

Postgraduate Program of Universitas Surakarta, Palur Highway, Jurug,  
Ngringo, Jaten Sub District, Karanganyar Regency, Central Java 57772

Email: Budimanwidodo5@gmail.com

Abstract: Presidential Regulation Number 86 of 2018 about Agrarian Reform. Land reform program using holistic approach is Asset reform and Access reform approach. This research aims to analyze public participation in Agrarian Reform program implementation in Jenawi Sub District of Karanganyar Regency, Central Java. The research method used was descriptive qualitative research, to find out, to analyze and to describe public participation in agrarian reform program implementation.

Cohen and Uphoff (1977) confirmed that public participation in development process consists of 1) *participation in decision making*, 2) *participation in implementation*, 3) *participation in benefits* dan 4) *participation in evaluation*. The result of research showed that public participation occurs in the implementation of agrarian reform program only, but the coordination has not been effective yet between Agricultural and Animal Husbandry Office and Trading Office. The result of research recommends 1) the need for the coordination between related units in agrarian reform implementation, and 2) the socialization of program is important to do in order to understand and to participate actively.

**Keywords:** Agrarian; Reform; program; participation; public; asset; access; implementation, decision, benefits;

Biographical notes:

**Winarti**, was born in Boyolali Regency in 1960, now is living in Surakarta City, Central Java, Indonesia. She has studied since 1966 when she was enrolled in Primary School, and she studied at graduate and postgraduate program in Gadjah Mada University of Yogyakarta, and obtained doctorate degree in Brawijaya University in Malang City in 2009.

She is a lecturer in Universitas Slamet Riyadi Surakarta (Slamet Riyadi University of Surakarta) in Surakarta City, in Public Policy Analysis Specialty, has attended many scientific seminars and meetings both at home and abroad, her scientific works have been published in some International and National journals. She is the author of a book entitled *Kebijakan Pertanahan di Indonesia* (Land Affair Policy in Indonesia) (2017).

**Suranto, J.** was born in Wonogiri Regency in 1959, Wonogiri is one of cities in Central Java Province, Indonesia. Currently he is living in Karanganyar Regency, Central Java, Indonesia. He got last education in Universitas Widya Putra Surabaya. He is a lecturer in Slamet Riyadi University of Surakarta, with Sociology specialty. His scientific work about Healthcare Service Quality has been published in *Jurnal Transformasi* (2013), and he has attended many seminars and scientific activity.

**Widodo, B.** was born in Boyolali Regency in 1960 and no is living in Surakarta City, Central Java, Indonesia. He has studied since 1966 when he was enrolled in Primary School in his origin city, he studied at graduate and postgraduate program in Gadjah Mada University of Yogyakarta, and obtained doctorate degree in Brawijaya University in Malang City in 2012.

She is a lecturer in Surakarta University in Karanganyar Regency, Central Java, Indonesia, with Public Policy specialty. He is an author of some books entitled: *Kebijakan Perkotaan dan Daerah* (Urban and Local Policy) (2014), and *Liberalisasi Pertanian* (Agricultural Liberalization) (2016), and has attended some seminars or discussions.

This article has been presented International Convergence in *Universitas Teknologi Malaysia* on April 7 2019



## **1 Introduction**

Agrarian structure gap in Indonesia is still a serious problem to solve immediately in Indonesia; thus the government considers the need for the realisation of even distribution of land mastery, ownership, use, and utilisation structures. Agrarian reform is a governmental program to deal with the even distribution of land mastery, ownership, use, and utilisation structures problem. As a legal foundation of its implementation, the government issues Presidential Regulation Number 86 of 2018 about Agrarian Reform. National Agrarian Reform Program (Indonesian: Program Pembaruan Agraria Nasional or PPAN) launched by the government attempts to use holistic approach not only considering agrarian reform as asset reform but also touching the access reform aspect.

Agrarian Reform Program aims to:

- a rearrange the gap of land mastery and use into the fairer (more just) one
- b reduce poverty rate
- c create job opportunity
- d improve the people's access to economic sources, particularly land; reduce land affair dispute and conflict
- e improve and maintain the quality of living environment and improve food self-sufficiency.

Land Affair Office of Karanganyar Regency, as the executor of Agrarian Reform Program, cooperates with some related Regional Work Units (Indonesian: or SKPDs): Agricultural, Animal Husbandry, and Trade Services. Although it has involved several related

institutions in its implementation, the Agrarian Reform program will be surely unfruitful without support from the public as the subject of program.

Considering the background above, the author has conducted a study entitled “An Analysis on Public Participation in Agrarian Reform program in Jenawi Sub-district of Karanganyar Regency” aiming to describe the participation of public (community) in the implementation of agrarian reform program, viewed from its asset and access aspects.

## **2 Literature study**

The word participation, according to Keith Davis (Reksopoetranto, 1992), etymologically derives from English word ‘participation’ meaning to take part or commonly called taking part. Therefore, participation is often defined as participating or taking part in certain activity.

Public participation in development includes the activities in planning and implementing program or development project performed in local community as a form of active community empowerment oriented to the achievement of development result, conducted effectively and efficiently within community viewed from input (HR, fund, equipment/facility, data, plan, and technology), process (implementation, monitoring, and supervision), and output aspects (the achievement of target effectively and efficiently).

Considering the definition, Ndraha (1990) elements in participation:

- 1 participation means mental and emotional
- 2 motivates persons to contribute to the situation
- 3 encourage people to accept responsibility in activity.

Considering some opinions above, it can be suggested that public participation is the public (community)’s conscious participation in development process in the attempt of achieving a better condition than before. Furthermore, the result of research conducted by Orlik and Rozele (2008, p.184) showed that land redistribution can improve public participation in improving domestic (household) economy and in solving land affair problem.

Participation is necessary to develop a synergy in the relationship between government and community and a synergy in ‘community network’. In development activity, community participation is the manifestation of community’s awareness, concern, and responsibility for the importance of development aiming to improve their quality of life. It means that through this participation they will actually be aware not merely that development activity is an obligation to be implemented by government (apparatus) itself but it also requires the participation of community members whose quality of life will be improved. Rodriguez (2006) discussed the role of state in governing land ownership system and land ownership document that will result in law certainty in land ownership, because people will get the right of payment over their arable land asset.

## 2.1 Dimensions of public participation

### 2.1.1 Public participation in planning

Participation in development planning is a very important component to the successful development projects. Participation in planning development programs can develop independency needed by villagers for the sake of development accelerating (see Ndraha, 1990). Korten (1981) said that the program beneficiary community should be involved in identifying development problem and in the process of planning a development program (Supriatna, 2000). Considering this, it can be said that community should participate or be involved actively in planning development so that their participation will continue in subsequent stages. The dimension of public participation in planning, particularly development program planning can be measured using five indicators:

- 1 participation in meeting or discussion
- 2 willingness to provide data and information
- 3 participation in arranging development plans
- 4 participation in determining the need priority scale
- 5 participation in decision making.

### 2.1.2 Public participation in implementation

Regarding the participation in development implementation, Cohen and Uphoff (1977) stated that participation in development involves

- 1 participation in resource
- 2 participation in administration and coordination
- 3 participation in program registration.

Furthermore Ndraha (1990) suggested that participation in implementation involves

- 1 directing power and fund
- 2 administration and coordination
- 3 elaboration in program.

Considering the explanation above, to measure the dimension of public participation in development implementation, four indicators are used:

- 1 community's activeness in development implementation
- 2 willingness to contribute thought, expertise, and skill
- 3 willingness to contribute money and material
- 4 responsibility for a successful development.

### *2.1.3 Participation in receiving and utilising the result*

Cohen and Uphoff (1977) stated that participation in accepting and utilising the result of development can be divided into four. The first one is material benefit such as improved income or other asset important to personal interest. The second is social, education, health benefits and other services. The third is individual benefit such as self-development, political power, and public trust that an individual begins to be able to control its power. The fourth is the expected consequence. Ndraha (1990) stated that participation in receiving the result of development means

- 1 receiving each of development results as if it is its property
- 2 using, utilising each of development result
- 3 organising (creating business opportunity and exploiting it) such as electricity power, village enterprise and etc.
- 4 maintaining routinely and systematically, not leaving it damaged and assuming that there will be governmental grant for developing the new one
- 5 governing its use and utilisation, organisation, and security.

Considering the elaboration above, the indicator of the dimension of participation in receiving, utilising, and maintaining, as well as developing the results of development include:

- 1 understanding on the essence of development
- 2 the willingness to receive and utilise the results of development
- 3 the willingness to preserve the results of development
- 4 the willingness to expand the result of development.

### *2.1.4 Participation in result supervision and evaluation.*

Every development attempt taken, of course, requires supervision so that the implementation of development activity can be compatible to the plan specified previously and when deviation occurs, it can be corrected immediately. In relation to public participation in supervising development, Kartasmita (1997) said that “without supervision and control, what is planned and implemented can go toward the direction in contradiction with the specified objective.” It indicates that the community’s supervision in development should be implemented absolutely, so that in addition to making what is done consistent with the specified plan, it can also ensure that the result of development, either physical or non-physical, can meet the community’s need. Ndraha (1990) said that to make the supervision working, some requirements or conditions are needed:

- 1 clear norm, rule, and standard
- 2 the attempt of monitoring the activities governed with such norm or rule
- 3 adequate, reliable, and timely available information on activity and result of corresponding activity
- 4 activity evaluation, as the control of norm and information

- 5 decision to determine the result of evaluation
- 6 and decision implementation action.

Considering the elaboration above, to measure the dimension of public participation in development supervision, seven indicators are used:

- 1 standard norm or rule
- 2 community's opportunity of conducting supervision
- 3 activeness in conducting supervision
- 4 effect of state and regional income
- 5 effect on job opportunity creation and labour absorption
- 6 effect on other sector development
- 7 recommendation and critique from the community.

In relation to the successful implementation of Agrarian Reform program, it is not only the government but also the community that should be responsible for it, so that the active public participation is very desirable. It means that the community is also responsible for the implementation, and receiving, and preserving the results of development.

Agrarian Reform has been known in Indonesia since 1960. It can be seen from the enactment of Law Number 5 of 1960 about Regulations of Basic Agrarian constituting the milestone for the attempt of going toward agrarian justice in Indonesia. However, such measure was then made a political commodity so that a tempest occurred in 1965 and the power was held by New

Order regime, in which land reform was so 'illicit' that could not be held. Bachriadi (Declaration of Agrarian Reform [Indonesian: Deklarasi Pembaruan Agraria], Jogjakarta, 1998) revealed:

"The fundamental development oversight is the positioning of agrarian reform constituting the rearrangement of agrarian source mastery, use, utilization, allocation, and maintenance to be the precondition of development. Agrarian reform is also believed to be a process of reorganising and reconstructing the society's social structure, particularly rural society, in order to create a healthy agricultural foundation, to ensure the certainty of land mastery for the people as their life resource, social welfare and social benefit system for rural people, and the use of natural resources as much as possible for the people's prosperity".

Agrarian Reform should be a broader development attempt involving multi-parties to ensure that the land asset given can develop productively and sustainably. It includes the fulfilment of basic rights in broad sense, including education, health, and providing supporting capital, technology, management, infrastructure, market, and etc. The first component is called asset reform, while the second is called access reform. The combination of the two types of reform is called land reform plus. In line with the



definition above, agrarian reform based on Pancasila and the 1945 Constitution (UUD, 1945). It means that the mechanism of 'land reform' is to reorganise the processes considered as unfair by adding access reform so that the land distribution to the farmers can be used as a reproduction tool.

The objective of Agrarian Reform implementation consists of seven formulations: a to reorganise the gap of land mastery and use structure into the fairer one

- b to reduce poverty rate
- c to create job opportunity
- d to improve the people's access to economic sources, particularly land; to mitigate land affair dispute and conflict
- e to improve and to maintain the quality of living environment and to improve food self-sufficiency.

Considering the formulations above, the objective to be achieved in agrarian reform program is essentially to make the people prosperous through land ownership certainty with the possession of land deed, and to enable the people to enjoy/utilise the land ownership by the attempt of improving productivity. Based on the theoretical study above, to analyse public participation in agrarian reform, the author has determined some indicators to see the public participation in agrarian reform:

- a public participation in planning
- b public participation in implementation
- c public participation in receiving and utilising the result
- d public participation in result supervision and evaluation.

### **3 Method**

This research employed descriptive analytical method. Descriptive research, according to Arikunto (2003), is the one not intended to test certain hypothesis, but only to describe 'just the way it is' a variable or phenomenon or condition. The approach used in this study was qualitative one. This research took place in Jenawi Sub-district, Karanganyar Regency; this location was selected because Jenawi Sub-district is one of target areas for the implementation of agrarian reform program.

The informant of research consisted of the people living in the research locus, consisting of six persons including employees of Karanganyar Regency's Land Affair Office, Village Head, and members of community. The informants were selected using snowball sampling. In this technique, the author looked for accurate informant source by asking other informants considered as capable of giving information needed in this study. Meanwhile, techniques of collecting data used were:

- 1 observation, in which the author visited directly the research locus and observed the participation of community in Jenawi Sub-district

- 2 interview, conducted by studying and exploring information from members of community and village head comprehensively and objectively.

Technique of analysing data employed was qualitative data analysis, i.e., describing, elaborating, and analysing data based on the result of interview and field observation. The information received by the author was organised, edited, corrected, and then retyped because most data obtained have not been ready to analyse as they were still in the form of raw data (field note unreadable to others, non-transcribed recording, non-printed and non-categorised photograph). The large number of qualitative data should be reduced and divided into the existing categories. The elaboration process in qualitative research is conducted by connecting the specified theory to the findings in the field, in order to be interpreted.

#### **4 Result and discussion**

Jenawi Sub-district is one of Sub-district s existing in Karanganyar Regency; land reform program activity with asset redistribution cannot be implemented in Jenawi Sub-district because there is indeed no dormant state land. The government's attempt of improving the people's welfare in Jenawi Sub-district of Karanganyar Regency is taken through agrarian reform program driven by the regency's land affair office and community's support through its participation, as explained.

##### *4.1 Public participation in planning*

Information obtained through interviewing the employees of land affair office shows that the agrarian reform in both access and access component is implemented more by the bureaucracy in Karanganyar Regency, particularly in land affair office, trade service, and animal husbandry service, so that the members of community (publics) are more passive in the planning.

Article 19 clause (1) of Basic Agrarian Law Number 5 of 1960 about the Basics of Agrarian confirms that to ensure law certainty, the government conducts landregistration throughout Indonesia. In relation to this, Republic of Indonesia's National Land Affair Agency is assigned to implement the acceleration of land registration constituting the part of Agrarian Reform including Asset Reform and Access Reform. Korten (1981) stated that

“the program beneficiary community should be involved in identifying development problem and in the process of planning development program” (Supriatna, 2000).

The result of interview with one of community leaders in Jenawi Village shows that “we have never participated in planning the activity, but importantly the result or output is good to the community”. Community non-involvement in the program planning is indeed realised because the program has been determined at regency level; it is intended to implement the program as soon as possible.

#### *4.2 Public participation in the implementation*

Frankly, the participation of Jenawi Sub-district people in the implementation of agrarian reform program has not been as expected by the government as this policy's initiator. The head of Jenawi village said that in the implementation, particularly in land certification program, the village officers "pick the ball up" actively; it is intended to collect the required documents in the village office immediately. It means that public participation in this program implementation belongs to passive participation, while the agrarian reform program aims to make the people prosperous, so that is not redundancy that the people (members of community) are required to participate actively in all programs. The word participation, according to Keith Davis (Reksopoetranto, 1992), etymologically derives from English word "participation" meaning to take part or commonly called taking part. Therefore, participation is often defined as participating or taking part in certain activity.

#### *4.3 Public participation in receiving and utilising the result*

Viewed from the public participation in receiving and utilising the result, the people of Jenawi Sub-district can receive this agrarian reform program. The result of interview with employees of land affair office, village heads and community leaders shows the same.

Community leaders said that this program is good and we support it because land issue is the problem occurring in the community, so that we will have been composed if we have had land deed. And when the author asked why do they register their land deed just now? They replied that the presence of Prona program, the process and procedure become easy and not elaborate". Meanwhile, the result of interview with one of village heads show that many people actually want to pay more as long as they get the legality of land ownership. It means that basically the people realise the importance of land ownership evidence (proof) to them, but many of them do not understand the procedure to register it; therefore through Prona program implemented in their region, they have big hope and support it.

The people seem to have not utilised this program particularly viewed from many villagers who have had land deed yet but do not utilise it to increase their business capital. They assume that the legality of ownership has been sufficient to be stored in their own home. Education and training conducted aiming to improve family economy has not been implemented effectively by the people. As suggested by the employees of land affair office, the implementation of asset and access components is conducted through the cooperation between several related SKPDs; it is conducted corresponding to the competency of SKPD to enable this program to achieve its objective.

#### *4.4 Public participation in result supervision and evaluation*

"The community's supervision over this program implementation is still poor, their life pattern is simple and just the way they are", said one of village heads in Jenawi Sub-district. Furthermore, there has been supervision by conducted by non-government organisation (NGO) but the institution does not come from outside Jenawi Sub-district.

## 5 Conclusions

Considering the result of research, the following conclusions can be drawn.

- 1 Land distribution does not occur in Jenawi Sub-district recalling that there is no dormant state land in this region.
- 2 Public participation level in Agrarian Reform program in Jenawi Sub-district belongs to participation or active participation since the planning stage.
- 3 Basically, public participation in the implementation of agrarian reform program is limited to data collection and showing the border of land.
- 4 Viewed from the level of participation in receiving and utilising the result or output of program, the people are very glad and enthusiastic with the agrarian reform program, but they seem to have not utilised it yet, because they have been satisfied with the ownership of land deed.
- 5 The supervision is conducted by non-government organisation coming from outside Jenawi Sub-district.

## References

- Cohen, JM, and N.T. Uphoff, 1977, *Rural Development Participation*, Cornell University RDCCIS: New York.
- Kartasmita, Ginanjar, 1997, *Pembangunan Untuk Rakyat: Memadukan Pertumbuhan dan Pemerataan*, Pustaka Cidessindo: Jakarta.
- Kartasmita, G. 1997, Pemberdayaan Masyarakat: Konsep Pembangunan yang Berakar Pada Masyarakat, Makalah disampaikan pada Sarasehan DPD GOLKAR Tk I Jawa Timur, Surabaya, 14 Maret 1997.
- Korten, David, 1981, *Bureaucracy and The Poor: Closing The Gap*, Mc Graw Hill: New York.
- Ndaraha, T., 1990, *Pembangunan Masyarakat: Mempersipakan Masyarakat Tinggal Landas*, Rineka Cipta, Jakarta.
- Orlik, T. and Rozelle, S. (2008) 'China land reform: speeding the plough', *Far Eastern Economic Review*, November, Hong Kong Vol. 171, No. 9, pp.184.
- Reksopoetranto. S., 1992. *Manajemen Proyek Pembangunan*. FE Universitas Indonesia. Jakarta.
- Rodriguez, E.B. (2006) *The Role of the State in Land Reform Processes, the Case of Brazil*, June, University of Salamanca, Spain.
- Supriatna, Tjahya, 2000, *Strategi Pembangunan dan Kemiskinan*, Rineka Cipta, Jakarta.
- Law Number 5 of 1960 about Agrarian Basic Regulation
- Presidential Regulation Number 86 of 2018 about Agrarian Reform.