

## **Community Participation in Development in Modelidu Village, Telaga Biru District, Gorontalo Regency**

Rusli Abdurrahman Idji<sup>1</sup>, Robin Pakudu<sup>1</sup>, Rahmawaty Tue Domili<sup>1</sup>, Rahmawati S. Puh<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Public Administration, Muhammadiyah University of Gorontalo

Email: [rusliabdurahm@gmail.com](mailto:rusliabdurahm@gmail.com)

Received: October 15, 2023

Received in Revised: November 17,  
2023

Accepted: December 20, 2023

### **Abstract**

This research aims to obtain an overview of community participation in development in Modelidu Village, Telaga Biru District, Gorontalo Regency. The research method uses a qualitative type using a descriptive approach. Data collection techniques are carried out through interviews, observation and documentation. The results of the research show that, participation in decision making is not optimal, there is low level of community awareness. This can be proven by the low level of community participation and involvement in attending meetings and outreach, participation in implementation is not optimal, there is a lack of communication between the Village Officials. In this case, the Head of Modelidu Village also triggered the low level of community participation. In fact, the form of community participation is closely related to how the community feels involved in development. Participation in utilizing the development that has been produced in Modelidu Village has provided sufficient benefits for the local community, both physical development produced in Olihitega Platdeker and Drainasse Hamlets, Participation in Evaluation. The level of awareness and low level of public education greatly influences community involvement in development.

**Keywords:** Participation, Community, Development

### **Introduction**

Law Number 9 of 2015 concerning Regional Government regulates the implementation of a decentralized system in Indonesia, where the central government grants greater authority to regions to carry out a series of processes, mechanisms, and planning stages that can ensure development harmony. The rationale for village regulation adopted in Law No. 9/2015 actually maintains what was adopted in Law No. 22/1999, namely diversity, participation, genuine autonomy, democratization, and community empowerment. This foundation is in stark contrast to that previously adopted in Law No. 5/1979, which explicitly states that it aims to standardize the form and structure of village government with a national character (Pratama, 2016; Riyani & Sutarna, 2016).

Community participation is often discussed in various regions, both urban and rural, because we can see the significant influence of such participation (Kenny et al., 2015; Rasoolimanesh et al., 2017; Taylor, 2007). This participation is crucial for planning or programs within their area. The success of a program without community participation will not be successful. Therefore, community participation is essential in planning or programs to ensure their proper implementation (Howard-Grabman et al., 2017; Blair, 2004). Planned programs are certainly closely related to community development. Therefore, the community is required to participate in development. For development to proceed as expected, community participation is essential in carrying out development activities.

Community participation in the implementation of development programs requires community awareness of their interests and concerns, and the strategy implemented is an awareness-raising strategy (Aitken et al., 2016; Maya et al., 2023). The role of the community in development today is not merely as an object, but also as a subject of development. The principle of people-centered development emphasizes that the community must be the primary actor in development (Kurniyati, 2019; Waruwu, 2021).

The concept of community participation is directly related to the essence of democracy as a system of government that focuses on the people as sovereign (Saati, 2015). Community participation takes many forms, ranging from direct community involvement in government programs to indirect ones, such as contributions of funds, labor, ideas, and income in government policymaking. However, the type and extent of participation are often determined by the mass scale, namely by the number of individuals involved. However, community participation is essentially related to the community's access to information.

To date, community participation remains limited to participation in the implementation of government programs or activities, even though community participation is necessary not only during implementation but also from the planning stage and even during decision-making (Akbar et al., 2018). Community participation is a key determinant of successful development implementation. On the other hand, village or sub-district development is directed at the obligations between the government and the community. Even in the main points of Village development policy, it is formulated that the mechanism of Village or sub-district development is a harmonious and harmonious combination of two main activity groups, namely various government activities as the first activity group and various community participation activities as the second main group.

In Article 78 of Law No. 6 of 2014 it is explained that Village development aims to improve the welfare of Village communities and the quality of human life as well as poverty alleviation through fulfilling basic needs, building Village facilities and infrastructure, developing local economic potential and utilizing natural resources and the environment in a sustainable manner (Sembel et al., 2017; Setiawan & Rhama, 2021). Participation-in village development is crucial. Without community participation, development cannot be considered complete.

This is particularly true for both physical and non-physical development (Bihamding, 2019; Nikijuluw, 2001). Many communities lack participation in physical development through collaborative projects for infrastructure and facilities, as is also the case in Modelidu Village, Gorontalo Regency. Community participation in non-physical programs involves community involvement in contributing ideas to the development process. Participation can be demonstrated through various opportunities, such as meetings, letters, suggestions, and responses to the development process.

Ideas and contributions can be channeled through existing formal institutions. To determine community participation in development in Modelidu Village, in the form of ideas and ideas, we can examine their participation in meetings and their active participation in providing opinions and suggestions. The author's initial observations, conducted through interviews with several village officials and community leaders in Modelidu Village, revealed several obstacles, including a lack of community involvement in meetings held by the Modelidu Village government.

Sometimes, when invited to attend meetings, they can be hours late, with only a small portion of the community attending. This often hampers development implementation in Modelidu Village, resulting in suboptimal implementation. Several previous studies related to community participation in development have been written by several authors, such as Mulyana (2012)

entitled "Community Participation in Village Development in Banjar Panjang Village, Kerumutan District, Pelalawan Regency."

The research showed that the factors influencing community participation in village development in Banjar Panjang Village, Kerumutan District, Pelalawan Regency were: Age, with the dominant age group (72 people) being between 21 and 55 years old; Gender, with the dominant gender (63 people) being male; Education with the dominant education level (33 people) being elementary school; Occupation/Income, with the dominant occupation/income factor (40 people) being oil palm farmers; and Length of Residence.

Further research was conducted by Letsoin (2015), entitled "Community Participation in Development Implementation in Coa Village, Kaimana District, Kaimana Regency." The results of this study indicate that the level of community participation in the village is sufficient for the implementation of the PNPM-MP project in their village. Furthermore, of the five types of participation studied, labor participation significantly contributed to the PNPM-MP project, particularly the construction of village roads.

Further findings revealed that the Coa Village Head and his staff were quite active and successful in carrying out their functions and roles in encouraging and directing community participation, thus successfully completing one of the PNPM-MP projects, namely the Village Road, as expected by the community. These two studies differ from this study in that, in terms of the problem, the researchers addressed the lack of community involvement in decision-making meetings; minimal community involvement in benefit allocation; lack of community involvement in program or project implementation socialization meetings; and lack of community involvement in evaluation meetings.

This study employed the concept (Cohen & Uphoff, 1977), which differentiates participation into four types: first, participation in decision-making, second, participation in implementation, third, participation in benefit allocation, and fourth, participation in evaluation. This study is considered urgent to assess the extent of village community participation in development in Modelidu Village, Telaga Biru District, Gorontalo Regency. Consistent with the previously described phenomenon, it remains very minimal and under-involved.

## **Methods**

This study employed a qualitative approach with a descriptive approach, aiming to uncover and describe facts regarding the level of community participation in village development in Modelidu Village, Telaga Biru District, Gorontalo Regency. The data sources for this study were primary and secondary. Primary data were collected from several key informants, including: the Modelidu Village Head; the Modelidu Village Secretary; the Hamlet Head; Village Officials; the Village Consultative Body (BPD), and the Modelidu Village Community. A total of eight informants were recruited. Secondary data were obtained through document searches related to the research requirements, such as journal articles, proceedings, books, and applicable laws and regulations. The data collection techniques employed included interviews, observation, and field documentation. Data analysis was conducted using qualitative descriptive analysis, consisting of several stages: data reduction, data display, and data verification.

## **Results and Discussion**

Modelidu Village covers an area of approximately 4,022 hectares and is divided into two hamlets: Hamlet I Jati and Hamlet II Olihi Tengah. According to the 2023 Village Profile, the population of Modelidu Village is 655, consisting of 352 males and 303 females. The majority of Modelidu Village residents work in the agricultural sector. Based on observations and

interviews with informants, research shows that many development programs implemented by the village government do not optimally involve the community in planning and evaluation. This creates a perception gap between the community and the government, and low levels of community education. This results in low community awareness, which ultimately leads to low levels of community empowerment. This is evident in the low level of community participation and involvement in development planning. This study uses the concept (Cohen & Uphoff, 1977), which distinguishes participation into four types: first, participation in decision-making, second, participation in implementation, third, participation in utilization, and fourth, participation in evaluation.

### **Participation in Decision-Making**

The concept proposed by Cohen and Uphoff explains that participation in decision-making is related to determining alternatives with the community to reach consensus on various ideas concerning the common interest. Participation in decision-making is crucial, as the community demands a role in determining the direction and orientation of development. This community participation in decision-making takes various forms, such as meeting attendance, discussions, contributing ideas, and responding to or rejecting proposed programs. Village community involvement in decision-making significantly assists the village head in selecting and considering decisions. Based on interviews with all informants and the author's observations, it can be concluded that the Participation in Decision-Making indicator is suboptimal, reflecting low community awareness. This is evident in the low level of community participation and involvement in meetings and outreach.

### **Participation in Implementation**

Cohen and Uphoff's concept of participation in program implementation is a continuation of previously agreed plans, including those related to planning, implementation, and objectives. Program implementation requires the involvement of various stakeholders, particularly the government, as the primary focus and source of development. Community participation and voluntary invitations to participate in development require significant trust, opportunity, and the village government's provision of opportunities for active participation in the development process. This type of participation is crucial for the success of the development program in Modelidu Village, and the village government is crucial in encouraging and raising awareness of participation in development implementation. This is crucial for fostering community awareness of development and active participation in development activities. Based on interviews with all informants and the author's observations, it can be concluded that the Participation in Implementation indicator is suboptimal. Lack of communication between village officials, particularly the Modelidu Village Head, contributes to the low level of community participation. In fact, the form of community participation is closely related to how the community feels involved in development.

### **Participation in Benefit Sharing**

Cohen and Uphoff's concept of participation in benefit sharing is inseparable from the quality of program implementation results achieved. In terms of quality, the success of a program is characterized by increased output. The benefits of development benefit all members of the community, regardless of status, position, class, age, and so on, because, essentially, the benefits of village development are for the common good. Therefore, special activities are needed to organize community members to maintain development outcomes so that their benefits can continue to be enjoyed. Based on interviews with all informants and the author's observations, it can be concluded that the Participation in Benefit Sharing indicator in

Modelidu Village has provided sufficient benefits to the local community, both in terms of the physical development in Hamlet II, Olihitenga, Platdeker, and Drainasse.

### **Participation in Evaluation**

Cohen and Uphoff's concept of community participation in development evaluation is manifested in the form of community participation in assessing and monitoring development activities and their results. Based on observations and interviews with research informants, a platform and drainage system are currently under construction in Hamlet II Olihitenga, Modelidu Village, and this requires supervision from various parties. Community participation in assessing development is a positive sign of support for the government. Community participation in evaluation can be achieved by monitoring work results and their implementation. At this stage, the community must be critical of what has been determined or implemented by the government. Without community evaluation, deviations often occur. Community participation in evaluating development in Modelidu Village encompasses various development outcomes that have been implemented, assessing their success or failure if, in the public's opinion, they are deemed suboptimal. The village's low level of awareness and low level of community education significantly impact community involvement in development.

### **Conclusion**

Based on observations, interview results and discussions related to the Community Participation Research in Modelidu Village, it was concluded that Participation in Decision Making was not optimal, low community concern itself, This can be proven by the low level of community participation and involvement in attending meetings and socialization; furthermore that participation in implementation was not optimal, the lack of communication between the Village Apparatus in this case by the Head of Modelidu Village also triggered the low level of community participation. Whereas the form of community participation is closely related to how the community feels involved in Development; furthermore participation in the utilization of development that has been produced in Modelidu Village has been sufficient to provide benefits to the local community, both physical development produced in Hamlet II Olihitenga Platdeker and Drainage; finally that participation in evaluation, the level of awareness and low community education greatly influence community involvement in development.

### **Suggestion**

The researcher suggests that the Modelidu Village Government should be able to establish good relations with the community. Furthermore, it is hoped that the Modelidu Village Government will budget free school funds for the less fortunate and the Village Government needs to provide an understanding to the community about the appropriate use of funds for development purposes, as well as restore the sense of mutual cooperation among the Modelidu Village community.

### **References**

- Aitken, M., Haggett, C., & Rudolph, D. (2016). Practices and rationales of community engagement with wind farms: awareness raising, consultation, empowerment. *Planning Theory & Practice*, 17(4), 557-576. <https://doi.org/10.1080/14649357.2016.1218919>
- Akbar, M. F., Suprpto, S., & Surati, S. (2018). Partisipasi masyarakat dalam perencanaan pembangunan di Desa Jatimulya Kabupaten Boalemo. *Publik (Jurnal Ilmu Administrasi)*, 6(2), 135-142. <https://dx.doi.org/10.31314/pjia.6.2.135-142.2017>
- Bihanding, H. (2020). *Perencanaan pembangunan partisipatif desa*. Yogyakarta: Deepublish.

- Blair, R. (2004). Public participation and community development: The role of strategic planning. *Public Administration Quarterly*, 28(1), 102-147. <https://doi.org/10.1177/073491490402800105>
- Cohen, J. M., & Uphoff, N. T. (1977). Rural development participation: concepts and measures for project design, implementation and evaluation.
- Howard-Grabman, L., Miltenburg, A. S., Marston, C., & Portela, A. (2017). Factors affecting effective community participation in maternal and newborn health programme planning, implementation and quality of care interventions. *BMC pregnancy and childbirth*, 17(1), 268. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12884-017-1443-0>
- Kenny, A., Farmer, J., Dickson-Swift, V., & Hyett, N. (2015). Community participation for rural health: a review of challenges. *Health Expectations*, 18(6), 1906-1917. <https://doi.org/10.1111/hex.12314>
- Kurniyati, Y. (2019). *Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pembangunan Desa Di Desa Mulyorejo 1 Kecamatan Bunga Mayang Kabupaten Lampung Utara* (Doctoral dissertation, UIN Raden Intan Lampung).
- Letsoin, H. (2015). Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Pelaksanaan Pembangunan di Desa Coa Distrik Kaimana Kabupaten Kaimana. *Politico: Jurnal Ilmu Politik*, 2(6), 1093.
- Maya Jariego, I., Holgado Ramos, D., & Santolaya, F. J. (2023). What works to promote community engagement: Strategic plan for volunteering and participation in Andalusia (Spain). *Analyses of Social Issues and Public Policy*, 23(2), 259-281. <https://doi.org/10.1111/asap.12344>
- Mulyana, S. (2012). *Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pembangunan Desa Di Desa Banjar Panjang Kecamatan Kerumutan Kabupaten Pelalawan* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Islam Negeri Sultan Syarif Kasim Riau).
- Nikijuluw, V. P. (2001). Aspek Sosial Ekonomi Masyarakat Pesisir dan Strategi Pemberdayaan Mereka dalam Konteks Pengelolaan Sumberdaya Pesisir Secara Terpadu. *IPB: Pusat Kajian Sumberdaya Pesisir dan Lautan*, 14-27.
- Pratama, A. Y. (2016). Pelaksanaan desentralisasi asimetris dalam tata kelola pemerintahan daerah di era demokrasi. *Jurnal Pendidikan Pancasila Dan Kewarganegaraan*, 28(1).
- Rasoolimanesh, S. M., Ringle, C. M., Jaafar, M., & Ramayah, T. (2017). Urban vs. rural destinations: Residents' perceptions, community participation and support for tourism development. *Tourism management*, 60, 147-158. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tourman.2016.11.019>
- Riyani, H. V., & Utama, M. P. (2016). *Kontribusi Manajemen Kelas, Motivasi dan Lingkungan terhadap Kedisiplinan Belajar Siswa Kelas V Sekolah Dasar di Dabin III Kecamatan Godong* (Doctoral dissertation, Universitas Muhammadiyah Surakarta).
- Saati, A. (2015). *The participation myth: outcomes of participatory constitution building processes on democracy* (Doctoral dissertation, Statsvetenskapliga institutionen, Umeå universitet).
- Sembel, T., Gosal, R., & Pangemanan, S. (2017). Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pembangunan Desa (Studi di Desa Sinsingon Barat Kecamatan Passi Timur Kabupaten Bolaang Mongondow). *Jurnal Eksekutif*, 1(1).

- Setiawan, F., & Rhama, B. (2021). Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pengelolaan Dana Desa Pada Desa Citaman Jernih Kecamatan Perbaungan Kabupaten Serdang Bedagai. *Jurnal Mediansosian*, 7(1).
- Taylor, M. (2007). Community participation in the real world: opportunities and pitfalls in new governance spaces. *Urban studies*, 44(2), 297-317.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/00420980601074987>
- Waruwu, Y. (2021). Analisis Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pelaksanaan Pembangunan Desa Guna Meningkatkan Kesejahteraan Masyarakat Di Desa Duria Kecamatan Lolofitu Moi Kabupaten Nias Barat. *Riset Manajemen dan Bisnis*.  
<https://doi.org/10.57094/pareto.v6i1.194>