

## The Determining Participation Factors of Coastal Communities in Development in the Indonesia-Malaysia Border Region

Syf. Aminah<sup>1</sup>, Sumardjo<sup>2</sup>, Arif Satria<sup>2</sup>, Irwan Abdullah<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Study Program Agriculture and Rural Development Communication, Bogor Agricultural University, Indonesia

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Human Ecology, Bogor Agricultural University, Indonesia

<sup>3</sup>Faculty of Culture Science, Gadjah Mada University, Indonesia

Corresponding author: Syf Aminah

**ABSTRACT:** State border regions are characterized by limited infrastructure and culture that are still in disadvantaged areas. Community participation in the development of the country's border regions is demonstrated through joint decision making to achieve development goals. This study used the survey method in Temajuk Village, Sambas Regency, West Kalimantan. The sample was determined using cluster random sampling technique with Dusun as cluster. Two hundred thirty-six samples were analyzed to fulfill the requirements of statistical tests. Data were analyzed using quantitative analysis including descriptive and multiple linear regression analysis. This study aims to analyze the factors that influence the level of participation of coastal communities in development. The result shows that: (1) the level of participation of coastal communities in development is low; (2) factors that influence the level of community participation in development are the family member dependents, participatory development communication, social environment, government intervention and infrastructure support.

**KEYWORDS :** *community participation, coastal community, border region*

### I. INTRODUCTION

State border region are characterized by infrastructural, cultural, still lagging regions with very limited social and economic facilities and infrastructure. The process of implementing the development program so far has not been integrated with the needs of the community so that community participation is low and the program is not on target. Community participation in development in the border region among country is the role of the community to be able to contribute in supporting the independence of the people in the border regions among countries in making decisions based on appropriate information. According to Sumardjo (2010) participation enables greater changes in the way people think. Changes through the process of participation give more meaning and benefit to the fulfillment of the needs of the people (community) as the subject of development or the subject of community development. Participation in planning, implementing / implementing, and evaluating programs, as well as utilizing the results of development programs is necessary, because it will increase their motivation to work together and increase opportunities for collective decision making. Deviyanti (2013) stated that community participation which is a factor that supports the community to be involved in a development activity is actually on the will of the community itself.

Increasing the active role of the community in development programs can be done to encourage the community to be more able to study their own problems, think of solutions to improve the condition of the community and develop potentials and skills to improve the welfare of life, so that the community feels involved in the development process. Patrick et al. (2016) suggested that community participation has an important role in rural development. Research Huruswati et al. (2012) proposed the development of a state border region with a participatory approach that involved the widest possible number of citizens with local organizations, local wisdom and local needs and respect for customary institutions which are potentials and sources of social welfare or social capital.

The coastal community development program between the border regions of Temajuk Village, which has been carried out so far, is a central and provincial government program that has not been oriented to the aspects of community needs. The role of the government with a centralized approach and one-way communication approach in which there is no mechanism to provide feedback from the community in participating in development programs creates community dependence on government assistance and ignores the local characteristics of coastal communities in border regions between countries. Development activities in

Temajuk Village that prioritize physical development and the development process lack of direct involvement of the community in the development program are felt that so far the program is not appropriate to the community's needs. The purpose of the study was to analyze the factors that influence the level of participation of coastal communities in development in the border regions between countries.

The concept of participation has been part of a prolonged debate among others related to theoretical foundations, and with the possibility of practical applicability in relation to various development programs implemented by various government and non-government institutions (Mikkelsen 1999). Community development must always strive to maximize participation, with the aim of making everyone in the community actively involved in community processes and activities, and to re-create the future of society and individuals. According to Ife and Frank (2008), participation is a central concept, and a basic principle of community development because, among many things, participation is a goal in itself; that is, participation activates the idea of human rights, the right to participate in democracy and to strengthen deliberative democracy.

Uphoff (1985) in Inagaki (2007) suggests that participation is carried out in stages: (1) participation in decision making, (2) participation in implementation, (3) participation in evaluation, and (4) participation in receiving benefits. People's participation can be manifested in various stages of development, namely participation in: (1) planning (decision making in programming), (2) implementation of development programs, (3) monitoring and evaluation stages, and (4) enjoying the process and development outcomes (Sayogyo 1994 in Sumardjo 2010).

## II. METHOD

This study used survey method which the data will analyze based on descriptive and multiple linear regression. This study was conducted on Temajuk Village, Paloh District, Sambas Regency, West Kalimantan Province. Temajuk Village is one of the littoral area of border region among countries in West Kalimantan.

This study used probability sampling of experimental design. It means that sampling was conducted based on mindset that all units of population have same opportunity for being a sample (Bungin 2006). Sampel size was determined to know totally samples with accuracy at 5% because characteristic of three Village is in homogenous data and with absolute limit of accuracy at 10%. Sample size has formula as in Slovin formula (Sevilla et al. 1993). Based on the calculation using Slovin formula, the minimum respondent is in 236 leader of family.

Collected data technique used two kinds of data as primer and secondary data. Primer data were the information that collected with direct study on field using quistionnaires. Secondary data were collected through source information from Badan Perencanaan Daerah (Bappeda), Sambas District, Sambas Central Bureau of Statistics, and Temajuk Village Office, Paloh Regency.

## III. RESULT AND DISCUSSION

### Participation in Development

The rate of community participant for development in research place is in low category (mean is in 36.1). It is showed by the lower participation from community for development followed processing development step, begun from program planning, program practicing, evaluation monitoring and result utilization. It means the rate of community participation for development is in low rate to support the development processing in Temajuk Village, caused by the community activity is just begun at 2015.

Table 1 Distribution of respondent based on participation variable for development

Participation for Development	Category	Total (n)	Percentage (%)
Program Planning Means is 34.1	Too low	95	40.3
	Low	72	30.5
	High	48	20.3
	Too high	21	8.9
	Total	236	100
Program Practicing Means is 39.8	Too low	76	32.2
	Low	82	34.7
	High	59	25.0
	Too high	19	8.1
	Total	236	100
Evaluation monitoring Means is 14.6	Too low	175	74.2
	Low	35	14.8

	High	18	7.6
	Too high	8	3.4
	Total	236	100
Utilization of Result Means is 55.9	Too low	23	9.7
	Low	63	26.7
	High	98	41.5
	Too high	52	22.0
	Total	236	100
Total of means			36.1

Note: score interval: too low 0 – 25, low 26 – 50, high 51 – 75, too high 76 – 100

### Program Planning

The aspect of program planning is in low category (means is in 34.1). The low score is caused by the lack of community participation for making-decision on development program. It is caused by community who is active only for come and listen the socialization about the program in village, but not give the respond like question, suggestion and opinion during socialization. In addition, during the socialization, there is no professional people on their discussion, so community is in not active for give the good respond for socialization. All the time, the program planning should be based on the discussion on forum with the expert or professional people who has knowledge about the program. The people are good potentially human resource in village, so the decision can be effective and efficient for farmer and fisherman needs. Legalization for development program planning is only desiccated by main committee, public figure in village, women group in village as delegation and government, with amount of community.

### Program Practicing

The aspect of program practicing on farmer and fisherman rate is in low category (means is in 39.8). The execution of the program is in low based on the respond by the active community who can give contribution like time and vigor helping, and also gives support like materials for development on program, minimum of the activity like training for program. It causes for the people who are active on program are only from main people in village, main committee in farmer and fisherman group and other from amount of committee on program planning. Otherwise, in research place, at this time is more dominant for development program practicing from government in Regency, Province and Ministry.

### Evaluation Monitoring

The aspect of evaluation monitoring is categorized in lower rate (means is in 14.6). The low rate of respond is caused by committee do not let in all community as monitor in this program. Committees think that the program is only committee and amount higher position in program who have the responsibility for monitoring. The result of monitoring activities is never announced to all community, so the participation is low rate that causes community do not know about the result and sustainability of the program for develop Temajak Village.

### Utilization of Result

The aspect of utilization of result on research place is in high category (means is in 55.9). The utilization of result is very useful for community such as the infrastructure support can help farmers and fishermen for their activities, although not too helping efficiently because still not enough for helping all their activities. Otherwise, from the economics side, it can not help much for farmers and fishermen to get the good salary than farmers and fishermen in Telok Melano Malaysia.

### Factors Influencing the Participation in Development

Community participation in development is in low rate (Table 2). The low rate of community participation is influenced by variables of family member ( $X_{1.3}$ ), participatory development communication ( $X_2$ ), social environment ( $X_3$ ), government intervention ( $X_4$ ) and infrastructure support ( $X_5$ ).

Table 2 Coefficient regression score of factors influencing community participation in development

Factors influencing community participation in development	participation in development		
	Regression coefficient	T	Sig.
Constant	0.371	1.362	0.175
Age ( $X_{1.1}$ )	-0.108	-0.676	0.500
Formal education category ( $X_{1.2}$ )	0.091	1.026	0.306

Family members (X <sub>1,3</sub> )	0.305	3.443	0.001**
Experience job (X <sub>1,4</sub> )	0.115	1.859	0.064
Salary (X <sub>1,5</sub> )	0.013	0.323	0.747
Gender perspective (X <sub>1,6</sub> )	-0.072	-0.906	0.366
Accessability (X <sub>1,7</sub> )	0.021	0.187	0.852
Participatory development communication (X <sub>2</sub> )	0.790	9.366	0.000**
Social environment (X <sub>3</sub> )	-0.683	-2.830	0.005**
Government intervention (X <sub>4</sub> )	-0.423	-2.303	0.022*
Infrastructure support (X <sub>5</sub> )	0.580	4.542	0.000**
R <sup>2</sup>			0.498
F <sub>calculated</sub>			20.171
Sig.			0.000 <sup>a</sup>

Note: \*significant on  $\alpha < 0,05$  dan \*\* significant on  $\alpha < 0,01$

The formula for regression of factors influencing community participation in development in Temajuk Village is

$$Y_1 = 0.371 + 0.305 X_{1,3} + 0.790 X_2 - 0.683 X_3 - 0.423 X_4 + 0.580 X_5$$

$$R^2 = 0.498 \dots\dots\dots(\text{Equation 2})$$

Regression analysis shows that  $R^2 = 0.498$ ; it indicates that 49.8% participation in development ( $Y_1$ ) can be explained by individual characters (family members) and four strong variables (participatory development communication, social environment, government intervention and infrastructure support). Competency of community that is in low rate is caused by lower of family members, participatory development communication, social environment, government intervention and infrastructure support.

The next result shows that factor that is dominant to influence participation in development is participatory development communication with 0.790 and infrastructure support with 0.580, if it is compared with family members, social environment and government intervention.

Based on regression analysis table shows that factors are in real making influence to participation in development. To examine hypothesis, it should be conducted with comparing score of  $t_{\text{calculated}}$  and  $t_{\text{table}}$  for each variable. If the score of variables is higher than  $t_{\text{table}}$  (1.96) on real level 0.05, so hypothesis is accepted.

### The Effect of Family Members to Participation in Development

Based on the result of multiple linear regression analysis (Table2), family members give influence for real to participation in development. Result of continued analysis shows that score of positive effect to participation in development. Family members have a relation with program planning, program practicing, evaluation monitoring and utilization of result. The results of the analysis of family member dependents in the littoral community of Temajuk Village are 4 people, the greater the family member members, the higher the level of participation in development. The results of Putriani *et al.* (2018) suggested that the contribution of the number of dependents to the level of participation significantly influence. The large number of dependents makes farmers compelled to do many activities in an activity and is encouraged to accept or respond to new innovations in order to increase family income.

### Effects of Participatory Development Communication on Participation in Development

Participatory development communication based on the results of multiple regression (Table 2) has a very real influence on increasing participation in development. The results of the analysis test show the value of a positive influence on increasing participation in development. The results of the analysis mean that increasing participation development communication increases participation in development. Participatory development communication will be able to increase the active role of the community in increasing the stages of participation in development.

The low condition of participatory development communication in the stages of the development process is seen in the stages of planning, implementing, monitoring evaluation and utilizing results. The reason for the lack of participatory communication in the planning stage is the lack of collective agreement and the absence of the role of assistants in helping to develop development plans, so that planning based on the desires of the proposed community members is not the result of joint studies with the facilitators.

The application of participatory development communication in the activities of implementing development programs is low due to the lack of dialogue levels in program implementation activities, so that the implementation of development programs in order to increase community participation is not optimal. The community does not have a role in determining the process of implementing development programs in the village because the implementation of the program is less socialized in the form of dialogue or consultation in the community. The implementation of the development program in the form of training to improve the skills of farmers and fishermen does not involve all groups of farmers and fishermen groups or other social groups. Participatory development communication at the monitoring stage of evaluation is low due to the low involvement of the community in monitoring the evaluation of development programs that have been

implemented at the village level. Monitoring and evaluation activities are only carried out by village officials, community leaders and representatives of groups in the community. This condition does not provide an opportunity for the community to submit proposals and suggestions about problems that still occur with farmers groups, fishermen groups and other social groups in implementing development programs so that the community has not been able to make improvements or overcome problems that arise. So far, proposals and suggestions by farmers and fishermen communities have been accepted but have not been accommodated in subsequent development programs. While participatory development communication in the stages of utilizing the results of new development is felt by farmers and fishermen related to road infrastructure support to support the activities of farmers and fishermen, but not yet on strengthening the capacity of self or groups of farmers and fishermen as well as economic support facilities and communication facilities that are still inadequate. The results of Aminah's research (2013) suggest that the level of application of participatory communication that affects the empowerment of successive farmers with the greatest influence is the application of participatory communication at the implementation stage, at the planning stage and at the monitoring stage.

### **Effect of Social Environment on Participation in Development**

Based on the results of the multiple linear regression analysis of the social environment (Table 2) has a very real and negative influence on participation in development, the higher the influence of social environmental factors, the lower the participation in development. Increasingly social environmental factors influence participation in development the lower.

Low participation in development, basically social environmental factors must be supported to strengthen human resources in the development process. The condition of the social environment that is still influenced by Malaysia, the community must continue to be given capacity building within the group, so that the community has the ability in self-defense and group resilience in the community to improve social security in the border environment between countries. Sangadji's research results (2010) suggest that environmental factors have not been able to make a meaningful contribution or a very small contribution to community participation consisting of indicators of benefits, responsibilities and relationships.

### **Effect of Government Intervention on Participation in Development**

Based on the results of the multiple linear regression analysis of government intervention (Table 2) has a very real and negative influence on participation in development, the higher the effect of government intervention the lower the participation in development. Increasingly, government intervention influences participation in development is lower.

The development program in Temajuk Village has so far been dominated by the central government, provincial and district governments. This is due to Temajuk Village development programs adapted to development programs as border areas between countries, namely the development of the National Strategic Area Center (PKSN), the National Strategic Tourism Area (KSPN) and the Water Conservation Area (KKP). So that development programs that are appropriate to the development and needs of the community are not prioritized, which causes a low process of community participation in development.

### **Effect of Infrastructure support on Participation in Development**

Infrastructure support based on the results of multiple regression (Table 2) has a very real influence on participation in development. The results of the analysis test show the value of a positive influence on increasing participation in development. Infrastructure support at the research location becomes a very important supporting tool in supporting community participation in development especially the community in interacting and accessing to communicate among fellow citizens. Although the current condition in Temajuk Village is infrastructure support in the form of transportation which is in the process of development being improved, communication facilities are still very minimal, especially the national electronic communication media (radio, television and telephone) as a media that strengthens access to information of people who are on borders between countries and economic institutions are less than optimal to support the economic activities of people on the borders between countries.

The efforts of the central government to improve infrastructure in the form of roads to provide opportunities to the littoral communities of Temajuk Village in supporting the intensity and activities of fishermen and farmers in development activities. Support for internet-based communication facilities is also one of the supporting activities of fishermen and farmers in Temajuk Village to obtain information based on community needs, so as to determine the priority of community-based development programs. Increasing infrastructure support improves community participation in development.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

Community participation in development is classified as low, which is reflected in the lack of program planning, program implementation, evaluation monitoring and utilization of results. Factors that influence the level of community participation in development are the family member dependents, participatory development communication, social environment, government intervention and infrastructure support.

#### V. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author thanks the people of Temajak Village and all respondents who participated in this research process. To all those who have helped, both directly and indirectly, so that this research can be carried out.

#### REFERENCES

- [1] Sumardjo. 2010. *Penyuluhan Menuju Pengembangan Kapital Manusia dan Kapital Sosial dalam Mewujudkan Kesejahteraan Rakyat*. Orasi Ilmiah Guru Besar dalam Rangka Dies Natalis IPB ke-47.
- [2] Deviyanti, D. 2013. Studi Tentang Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pembangunan Di Kelurahan Karang Jati Kecamatan Balikpapan Tengah. *EJournal Administrasi Negara*. Vol 1. No. 2: 380-392.
- [3] Patrick M, Deusedit B, Mathias T, Lawrence M, Amos KM, & Abodaya AAC. (2016). Community Participation and Rural Development in Bushenyi District, Western Uganda. *Journal of Asian Development*. 2 (2): 21-32. doi:10.5296/jad.v2i2.10041
- [4] Huruswati I, Kurnisari A, Purwanto AB, Sabeni M. 2012. *Evaluasi Program Pembangunan Kesejahteraan Sosial Di Desa Perbatasan Kalimantan Barat*. Jakarta (ID): P3KS Press.
- [5] Mikkelsen B. 1999. *Metode Penelitian Partisipatoris dan Upaya-upaya Pemberdayaan*. Penerjemah Mathoes Nalle. Jakarta (ID) : Yayasan Obor Indonesia.
- [6] Frank T, Ife J. 2008. *Community Development : Alternatif Pengembangan Masyarakat di Era Globalisasi*. Yogyakarta (ID) : Pustaka Pelajar.
- [7] Inagaki N. 2007. *Communicating the Impact of Communication for Development Recent Trends in Empirical Research*. The International Bank for Reconstruction and Development / The World Bank. Washington, U.S.A
- [8] Sumardjo. 2010. *Penyuluhan Menuju Pengembangan Kapital Manusia dan Kapital Sosial dalam Mewujudkan Kesejahteraan Rakyat*. Orasi Ilmiah Guru Besar dalam Rangka Dies Natalis IPB ke-47.
- [9] Bungin B. 2006. *Metodologi Penelitian Kuantitatif*. Jakarta (ID) : Kencana
- [10] Sevilla G, Consuelo. 1993. *Pengantar Metode Penelitian*. Penerjemah Alimuddin Tuwu. Jakarta (ID) : UI Press.
- [11] Putriani R, Tenriawaru AN, Amrullah A. 2018. Pengaruh Faktor-faktor Partisipasi Terhadap Tingkat Partisipasi Petani Anggota P3A dalam Kegiatan Pengelolaan Saluran Irigasi. *Jurnal Sosial Ekonomi Pertanian*. Vol 14. No. (3): 263 – 274
- [12] Aminah S. 2013. *Model Komunikasi Partisipatif Untuk Keberdayaan Petani Kecil dalam Mewujudkan Ketahanan Pangan di Kabupaten Halmahera Barat*. [Disertasi]. Bogor (ID): Sekolah Pascasarjana Institut Pertanian Bogor.
- [13] Sangadji MN. 2010. *Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Pengelolaan Taman Nasional dengan Pola Kemitraan di Kepulauan Togeang Sulawesi Tengah*. [Disertasi]. Bogor (ID): Sekolah Pascasarjana Institut Pertanian Bogor.