Factors Influencing Community Participation in Development Planning through Development Planning Forum (*Musrenbang*) in Sumbermanjing Wetan District Malang Regency

Rita Sanjayani ^a*

^a *Brawijaya University, Malang, Jawa Timur, Indonesia*

INFORMASI ARTIKEL

Article history:

Dikirim tanggal: 1 February 2016

Revisi pertama tanggal: 10 February 2016

Diterima tanggal: 16 February 2016

Tersedia online tanggal 16 September 2016

Keywords: *participatory development planning, community participation*

ABSTRACT

A good plan is needed as a guidance of development activity. Development planning forums (*Musrenbang*) which involve local community are held annually and in hierarchy from the lower level (Village) to higher level (National) in Indonesia. This research aims to determine the level and the factors influencing community participation in District *Musrenbang*. The method is quantitative by using Partial Least Square (PLS) analysis. The research finds that the community participation in Sumbermanjing Wetan District *Musrenbang* is in the fifth rung of Arstein's Ladder of Participation namely placation. According to PLS analysis result, the factors influencing community participation in District *Musrenbang* are culture, educational level, income, perception, and communication.

2016 FIA UB. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

One of the statehood's basic problems in government organizing, whether in central or local level, is how to develop and create government mechanism which is able to accommodate the government's mission to actualize *raison d'être* of government, i.e. equitably public welfare. To reach it, the government has to do the development. Ginanjar Kartasasmita (1997:9) states that development is a process of changing to the better direction through well-planned effort.

Planning is the early stage in the development process. Development planning is very crucial in determining the achievement of development goal. Riyadi and Bratakusumah (2004:6) convey that development planning is a beginning phase of development process. As beginning phase, development planning is guidance/reference/basis for the implementation of development activity. Development

planning will be right on target, well done and useful results if implemented to meet the needs of the community. However, planners and policymakers know very little about what the community exactly needs. Development planning will be right on target, well done and useful results if implemented to meet the needs of the community. However, planners and policymakers know very little about what the community exactly needs.

Involving beneficiaries in making decisions that predispose their lives is the key to make development more effective. Conyers (1991: 154-155) brings forward three main reasons why community participation in planning is urgent:

1. Community participation is a tool for gaining information about condition, needs, and local community behavior.

* Corresponding author. Tel.: +62-82222204284; e-mail: ritasanjayanistp@gmail.com

2. The community will have more trust to development activity program if they are involved in the preparation and planning, due to they know more about the program. They will also have a sense of belonging to the program.
3. It supports general participation due to the assumption that it is a democratic right when community is involved in development.

Act no. 25 year 2004 regarding National Development Planning System (Sistem Perencanaan Pembangunan Nasional/SPPN) was published as the legal base of development planning in Indonesia. SPPN has accommodated the participatory planning. Manifestation of participatory planning in SPPN is the Development Planning Forum (Musyawarah Rencana Pembangunan/Musrenbang). Musrenbang is held annually and in hierarchy from the lower level (Village) to higher level (National). One of stages of Musrenbang is District Musrenbang. However, some obstacles still occur in the implementation of community participation in District Musrenbang so that the researcher needs to know deeper about the community participation in District Musrenbang. This study attempts to examine the level of community participation in District Musrenbang. Furthermore, this study attempts to determine the factors influencing community participation in District Musrenbang.

2. Theory

There are several definition of development evolved among the scholars. According to Todaro and Smith (2006:15-17) development must be conceived of as a multi dimensional process involving major changes in social structures, popular attitudes, and national agencies, as well as process to accelerate the economic growth, the reduction of inequality, and the poverty alleviation. This definition signs that development is a process toward changes intended to improve life quality of the community themselves. Since rural area is wider than urban area in Indonesia, it is important to get closer looking to the rural community development. According to Tjokrowinoto (1999:35), rural community development can be done based on 3 principles, they are:

1) Integral development principle

The development must be in balance in all dimension of the community,

2) Self power principle

All development efforts must be on the community's own power,

3) Agreement principle

The development must be done properly in order to fulfill the community's needs. The decision to undergo a project is not headman's priority but the decision of all the members of the community.

Development strongly needs planning because the needs of development are higher than the available resources. Through planning, the development activity is formulated so as to efficiently and effectively achieve optimal result in using available resource and developing the potency.

Planning is a process that last over the entire implementation process; it is not a one-time activity. Involve key actors, including persons in other organizations, in the early stages of the planning process (Perry, 1989:253). Diana Conyers (1994:5) states that every single planning must be having implication or social aspect, therefore it can be considered that social planning has to be a form of direction for all the series of planning activity itself. This kind of planning is usually used by government and other body to overcome economic changing problem and social problem in general. It is known as development planning. Furthermore, Riyadi and Bratakusumah (2004:6) convey that development planning is a beginning phase of development process. As beginning phase, development planning is guidance/reference/foundation for the implementation of development activity.

The involvement of community in development planning is in accordance with the concept of sustainable development which is defined by Strange and Bayley (2008:25) as:

- Spreading the benefits of economic growth to all citizens;
- Turning brownfields into ecologically sound urban housing projects;
- Increasing educational opportunities for both girls and boys;
- Innovating industrial processes to be more energy-efficient and less polluting;
- Including citizens and stakeholders in policy-making processes.

Alexander Abe (2002:81) mentions the definition of participatory planning as following "Participatory planning is planning involving community needs in its goal and involving the people in its process (whether directly or indirectly). The goal and the method must be perceived as a unity. It is difficult to say that a goal regarding community needs is taking sides to the community if the beneficiary community is not involved in its formulation. Other argument, as stated by

Mubyarto (1984:35), community participation in rural development must be meant as willingness to help reaching the success of every program according to the ability of every person without sacrificing their own interest. Furthermore, it is also stated that, in the most ideal condition, community involvement is the value of their participation level. The bigger their ability to determine their own destiny, the bigger their ability in development.

Arnstein's ladder of participation is one of the best known models of community participation. Originally developed in the late 1960s, it retains considerable contemporary relevance. The model of Arnstein's ladder is presented in figure 1. 'Citizen control' appears at the top of the ladder, with a category of 'non-participation' at the bottom, in which therapy and manipulation are placed. Arnstein's point of departure is the citizen on the receiving end of projects or programmes. She draws a distinction between 'citizen power', which includes citizen control, delegated power and partnership, and 'tokenism', in which she includes consultation, informing and placation. It is worth noting the part that the activities she associates with 'tokenism' play in the efforts – and indeed the definitions of development organizations claiming to promote participation (Cornwall, 2008:270).

Source: Cornwall (2008:270)

Figure 1. Eight Rungs on the Arnstein's Ladder of Citizen Participation

Theoretically, there are relations among individual characteristics with participation level. Age, education

level, occupation, the length of becoming community member, earning, involvement in development activity strongly influence participation (Slamet, 1994:137-143). According to Sulaiman et. al (2014:2443), perception toward community program was the central among other individual factor that contribute to activate participation. It was reciprocal with the perception toward the organization.

Tjokroamidjojo (1996) in Girsang (2011:12) reveals that the factors which are important to be considered in community participation:

- 1) Leadership factor
Qualified leadership is very important to encourage the community participation;
- 2) Communication factor
New ideas, policies, and plans will get support if it is known and understood by the community.

Based on previous researches and existing literatures, the hypotheses are:

1. Community participation in development planning is significantly influenced by culture,
2. Community participation in development planning is significantly influenced by educational level,
3. Community participation in development planning is significantly influenced by income,
4. Community participation in development planning is significantly influenced by length of stay,
5. Community participation in development planning is significantly influenced by perception,
6. Community participation in development planning is significantly influenced by communication.

3. Method

This research uses quantitative design to measure the effect of independent variable towards dependent variable. This research uses survey approach which uses questionnaires as main approach in the research. Population researched in this study is all element of community directly involving in 2015 District Musrenbang of Sumbermanjing Wetan District, Malang Regency. This research uses saturated sample or census which uses all of the population as the sample. The researcher conducts this study in Sumbermanjing District Malang Regency.

The researcher analyzes the data by using descriptive and statistical analysis. Partial Least Square (PLS) is the statistical calculation used in this research to examine the hypothesis. PLS is used to examine whether the independent variables, which consist of

culture, educational level, income, length of stay, perception, and communication, significantly influence the dependent variable namely community participation.

4. Result and Discussion

4.1. Identity of Respondents

The number of respondents involved in this research is 84 persons. The number of male respondents is 79.80%, while the number of female respondents is 20.20%. The age of the respondents ranges from 25 years old to 55 years old. The respondents participating in this research come from various background of occupation. They work as private employee, head of village, retired, village's official, farmer, civil servant, and entrepreneur.

4.2. Level of Community Participation in District Musrenbang

Briefly, the research's result of eight rungs of Arnstein's Ladder of Participation is showed in Table 1. The table shows the percentage of respondents' answer regarding question of each rung's indicator. The highest answer of manipulation, therapy, informing, and consultation rungs is disagree. It means that those rung have been passed in Sumbermanjing Wetan District Musrenbang process. The highest answer of placation rung is agree. It indicates the presence of placation indicator in Sumbermanjing Wetan District Musrenbang process. While the highest answer of partnership, delegated power, and citizen control rungs is disagree which indicates that the indicator of each rung does not exist in Sumbermanjing Wetan District Musrenbang process.

Table 1. Recapitulation of Community Participation Degree's Indicator in District Musrenbang

No	Participation Indicator	Dis-agree (%)	Do Not Know (%)	Agree (%)	Explan-ation
1	In District Musrenbang, the communication is only unidirectional communication. There is no dialogue between the community and government districts.	92.86	2.38	4.76	Manipulation
2	In District Musrenbang, communication between the community and district government only occurs in limited manner.	90.48	2.38	7.14	Therapy
3	In District Musrenbang, delivered a draft of development activities which all come from the government, but there was no dialogue for the community to response to the draft	94.05	2.38	3.57	In-forming

4	In District Musrenbang, there is a dialogue between the district government and the community. The community is welcome to respond to proposed development activities of the government despite public proposals are not guaranteed to be accepted.	83.33	-	16.67	Consulation
5	In District Musrenbang, there is a dialogue between the district government and the community. The community is welcome to submit development activities proposals and will be considered to be implemented.	23.81	-	76.19	Placation
6	In District Musrenbang, the community and government all together plan and implement development activities.	94.04	-	5.96	Partner-ship
7	In District Musrenbang, the community has authority in designing, implementing, monitoring, and evaluating development activities. The community has full responsibility.	96.43	1.19	2.38	Delegated Power
8	In District Musrenbang, community fully manage a variety of activities for its own interests as mutually agreed. The role of the community is greater than the role of government.	91.67	-	8.33	Citizen Control

Source: Processed Primary Data (2015)

Most respondents' answers indicate that in Sumbermanjing Wetan District Musrenbang they had big opportunity to convey their opinions and proposals. Those opinions and proposals would be considered in the forum. Sidek (2012:3) mentions that placation rung is indicated by representing tokenism if those previously excluded from power remain a numerical minority on the board and/or are not accountable to any constituency in the community; another form is giving only power of advice or planning, but not to turn them into actual decisions. By comparing respondents' answers and the indicator of placation rung, it shows that placation rung has been exceeded in the process of Musrenbang in Sumbermanjing Wetan District.

The explanation regarding the implementation of Sumbermanjing Wetan District Musrenbang shows that district Musrenbang is not only a kind of forum which is ceremonial. The community has harnessed it as a forum for delivering and conveying their aspiration and urgent needs. All the proposals brought to district Musrenbang are the proposals resulted from village Musrenbang which come from the opinion and aspiration of the community within the village.

Although district Musrenbang facilitates the participants with big opportunity and chance to convey

their opinion and aspiration in discussion forum, not all proposals will accepted to be brought to regency Musrenbang. Based on the budget plafond and SKPD's work plan, the discussion forum will make priority scale of the proposals. This condition shows that the community participation in Sumbermanjing Wetan District Musrenbang only reaches the placation rung. Placation rung shows the degree of tokenism. It means that the community plays advisory role, however the decision-making role is still played by the government.

4.3. Culture

The respondents participating in this research come from different background of culture. They come from Java ethnic and Madura ethnic. The number of Javanese respondents is 85.7%. While, the number of Maduranese respondents is 14.3%. That composition shows that the number of Maduranese involved in Sumbermanjing Wetan District Musrenbang is quite small.

The significance test, as presented in appendix 1, shows the T-statistic value of each independent variable. Test criteria states that if the value of T-statistics $\geq$ T-table (1.96) then declared the significant influence of exogenous variables to endogenous variable. Hypothesis 1 (H1) states that culture significantly affects the community participation in District Musrenbang. The significance test in Appendix 1 reveals that the value of T-statistics > 1.96 . It means that culture significantly influences community participation in development planning. Thus, hypothesis 1 (H1) is met. It is in accordance with previous research of Ariantara. In his research, entitled Analisis Partisipasi Masyarakat terhadap Perencanaan Pembangunan di Kecamatan Pondok Kelapa Kabupaten Bengkulu Tengah, Ariantara (2014) revealed that cultural background is one of factors influencing community participation in development planning in Pondok Kelapa District Bengkulu Tengah Regency. He found that the community in village which is majority comprised of migrants people has higher participation that the community in village which is majority comprised of local people.

Influence between constructs can be assessed from the results of path coefficient yielded from PLS. The coefficients are calculated by means of a regular regression between the latent variable scores in accordance with the specified network of structural relations. Path coefficients of exogenous variables toward endogenous variable consist of positive and negative value. Positive path coefficients indicate that the increasing of exogenous variable will increase the endogenous variable as well. Reversely, negative path coefficients indicate that the increasing of exogenous

variable will decrease the endogenous variable. The value of culture variable's path coefficient is presented in Appendix 2. Appendix 2 shows that culture variable has path coefficient value of 0.110. It means that culture has positive path coefficient. The research's result reveals that participants with javanese culture background has higher participation than that with Maduranese culture background.

4.4. Educational Level

Majority of the respondents were graduated from senior high school and above. Well-educated respondents reach 84.50% in number. The number of respondents who passed junior high school is 9.5%. While, the quantity of the last group consists of respondents who only were graduated from elementary school is 6.00%.

Appendix 1 presents the significance test value of educational level variable. Hypothesis 2 (H2) mentions that educational level significantly affects the community participation in District Musrenbang. The significance test reveals that the value of T-statistics > 1.96 . It means that educational level significantly influences community participation in District Musrenbang so that hypothesis 2 (H2) is fulfilled. It is in accordance with previous researches. Suroso (2014) and Ariantara (2014) find that educational level affects the community participation in development planning. Their research shows that the knowledge level of society influences the participating efforts given by the society in development. Level of education one of the factors which affects the level of knowledge.

The value of educational level variable's path coefficient is presented in Table Appendix 2. Appendix 2 shows that educational level variable has path coefficient value of -0.178. The value indicates that educational level has negative influence to community participation in District Musrenbang. This condition indicates that the increasing educational level tends to reduce community participation in development planning. This happens because the participants with quite high educational level have capability to observe the result of prior Musrenbang which sometime not executed by the government. It results in their unwillingness to actively participate in the district Musrenbang.

4.5. Income

Based on their income, the respondents are categorized into 6 groups. Those groups are having income less than 1,000,000; 1,000,000-1,499,000; 1,500,000-1,999,000; 2,000,000-2,499,000; 2,500,000-2,999,000; and more than 3,000,000. The first group,

respondent with income less than 1,000,000, consists of 36.90% of respondents. The number of the second group, respondent with income 1,000,000-1,499,000, is 26.20% of respondents. The higher group, respondent with income 1,500,000-1,999,000, has a percentage of 6.00%. the fourth group, respondent with income 2,000,000-2,499,000, consists of 10.70% of respondents. 7.10% of respondents belong to the group of respondent with income 2,500,000-2,999,000. The highest group, respondent with income more than 3,000,000, has percentage of 13.10%. The group with highest percentage is the respondents with income less than 1,000,000. While, the group with lowest percentage is respondents with income 1,500,000-1,999,000. This condition indicates that most of the respondents have low income.

Hypothesis 3 (H3) states that income significantly affects the community participation in District Musrenbang. The significance test in Appendix 1 reveals that the value of T-statistics > 1.96 which means that income significantly influences community participation in development planning. Thus, hypothesis 3 (H3) is met. It is in accordance with the research of Sebayang (2005). In his research entitled *Hubungan Tingkat Pendidikan dan Pendapatan Dengan Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pengelolaan Lingkungan Hidup di Kisaran Barat Kabupaten Asahan*, Sebayang (2005) states that there is positive relation of income toward community participation in environmental management. The higher income level of community results in the more positive their attitude toward environment. It means that the higher income level results in the higher participation in environmental management.

The value of income variable's path coefficient is presented in Appendix 2. Appendix 2 shows that income variable has path coefficient value of 0.211. It means that income has positive path coefficient. The increasing of income will increase the participation in District Musrenbang.

4.6. Length of Stay

The respondents who participate in this research have different length of stay in Sumbermanjing Wetan District. Most of the respondents stay in the District from their birth, while several respondents were not originally born in the District. The respondents' length of stay are categorized into 5 (five) group. They are less than 20 years; 21-30 years; 31-40 years; 41-50 years; and more than 50 years. The first group, respondent with length of stay for less than 20 years, consists of 6.00% of respondents. The number of the second group, respondent with length of stay for 21-30 years, is 17.90% of respondents. The longer group, respondent

with length of stay for 31-40 years, has a percentage of 17.90%. the fourth group, respondent with length of stay for 41-50 years, consists of 39.30% of respondents. The number of the longest group, respondent with length of stay for more than 50 years, is 20.20%.

The group of respondents with length of stay for 41-50 years has the highest percentage. While, the group of respondents with length of stay for less than 20 years has the lowest percentage. This condition shows that most of the respondents have long length of stay in Sumbermanjing Wetan District. This condition is quite good for Sumbermanjing Wetan District Musrenbang process, because the participants have big sense of belonging and deep knowledge on the condition, issues, and needs of the community within the district.

Hypothesis 4 (H4) mentions that community participation in development planning is significantly affected by the length of stay. The significance test in Appendix 1 reveals that the value of T-statistics < 1.96 which means that length of stay does not significantly influence community participation in development planning. In other word, hypothesis 4 (H4) is rejected. It is in contradiction with the research of Indrayati (2013). In her research entitled *Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Pelayanan Kesehatan di Pusat Kesehatan Masyarakat Tembilahan Hulu Kabupaten Indragiri Hilir*, Indrayati (2013) states that length of stay influences the community participation in health service in Tembilahan Hulu Community Health Service Indragiri Hilir Regency. The longer someone stay in a place or community, the bigger sense of belonging to the place or the community and also the bigger participation within the community. Length of stay of the participants does not significantly influence the community participation in Sumbermanjing Wetan District Musrenbang. This condition is caused by the fact that most of the participants were originally born in the district so as the difference of length of stay does not significantly influence their participation in Sumbermanjing Wetan District Musrenbang.

Path coefficient value of length of stay variable is presented in Appendix 2. Appendix 2 reveals that path coefficient of length of stay variable is 0.054. It indicates that length of stay has positive path coefficient.

4.7. Perception

In this research, there are 4 (four) indicators which is used to measure community's perception toward Sumbermanjing Wetan District Musrenbang. The first indicator is respondent's belief that his/her opinion and

proposal will be appreciated and heard in Sumbermanjing Wetan District Musrenbang.

Table 2. Recapitulation of Community's Perception Indicator

Indicator	Strongly Accept	Accept	Not Accept	Strongly Not Accept	Average
Participant's opinion and proposal will be appreciated and heard in the forum	29.80%	69.00%	1.20%	-	3.29
District Musrenbang is not merely a formality but high credible forum	10.70%	33.33%	56.00%	-	2.55
District Musrenbang will give much contribution for development	11.90%	82.10%	3.60%	2.40%	3.04
Proposals resulted in District Musrenbang will be actually executed	6.00%	44.00%	48.80%	1.2%	2.55

Source: Processed Primary Data (2015)

The second indicator is respondent's belief that District Musrenbang is not merely a formality but high credible forum. The third indicator is respondent's belief that District Musrenbang will give much contribution for development. The fourth indicator is respondent's belief that proposals resulted in District Musrenbang will be actually executed. Briefly, Table 2 presents the respondents' answers regarding community's perception indicators.

Each indicator has different loading factor value. Contribution of perception variable measuring indicator is presented in Table 3. Based on the loading factor shown in Table 3, the perception variable measuring model is notated as following:

$X_{5.1} = 0.816$ Perception;

$X_{5.2} = 0.824$ Perception;

$X_{5.3} = 0.847$ Perception;

$X_{5.4} = 0.824$ Perception.

Table 3. Contribution of Perception Variable Measuring Indicators

Variable	Item	Loading Factors
Perception	X5.1	0.816
	X5.2	0.824
	X5.3	0.847
	X5.4	0.824

Source: SmartPLS Output (2015)

Hypothesis 5 (H5) states that perception significantly affects the community participation in District Musrenbang. The significance test in Appendix 1 reveals that the value of T-statistics > 1.96 which means that community participation in development planning is significantly influenced by perception. Thus, hypothesis 5 (H5) is fulfilled. This is in accordance with the research of Sulaiman et.al (2014). They find in their research entitled Determinants of Community Participation in Community Policing Program in Malaysia, that perception of the community toward Community Policing Program determine their participation within the program. Furthermore, they state that perception toward Community Policing Program was the central among other individual factor that contribute to active participation. It was reciprocal with perception toward police organization.

The value of perception variable's path coefficient is presented in Appendix 2. Appendix 2 shows that perception variable has path coefficient value of 0.227. It means that perception has positive path coefficient. The better of community's perception will increase the participation in District Musrenbang.

4.8. Communication

In this research, there are two indicators which is used to measure communication level in Sumbermanjing Wetan District Musrenbang. The first indicator is the existence of the prominent figure's role in capturing community's aspiration. The second indicator is the existence of dissemination of District Musrenbang's result which is approved in Regency Musrenbang. Briefly, the respondents' answers regarding community participation's indicator are presented in Table 5.20.

Table 4. Recapitulation of Communication Indicator

Indicator	Strongly Accept	Accept	Not Accept	Strongly Not Accept	Average
The existence of prominent figure's role in capturing community's aspiration	29.80%	61.90%	8.30%	-	3.21
The existence of dissemination of District Musrenbang's result which is approved in Regency Musrenbang	8.30%	52.40%	34.5%	4.8%	3.64

Source: Processed Primary Data (2015)

Each indicator has different loading factor value. Contribution of communication variable measuring indicator is shown in Table 5.21.

Table 5. Contribution of Communication Variable Measuring Indicators

Variable	Item	Loading Factor
Communication	X6.1	0.879
	X6.2	0.903

Source: SmartPLS Output (2015)

According the loading factor presented in Table 5, the communication variable measuring model is notated as following:

$X6.1 = 0.879$ Communication;

$X6.2 = 0.903$ Communication.

Hypothesis 6 (H6) mentions that communication significantly affects the community participation in District Musrenbang. The significance test in Appendix 1 reveals that the value of T-statistics > 1.96 which means that community participation in development planning is significantly influenced by Communication. In other word, hypothesis 6 (H6) is met. It is in line with the research of Kamuiru and Mbiwsa (2014). Their research entitled Factors Influencing Community Participation in Project Planning in Kenya. A Case Study of Mbucana Water Dam Project, Kiambu County, finds that community participation in project planning is affected by communication. More than half of the population represented by 55% of the respondents lamented to having never communicated or received any form of communication of any undertakings within the community. This lack of communication could be the

same reason that makes most of the respondents (65%) not to trust the local leaders on issues development.

The value of communication variable's path coefficient is presented in Appendix 2. Appendix 2 shows that communication variable has path coefficient value of 0.199. It means that communication has positive path coefficient. The better communication will increase the participation in District Musrenbang.

4.9. Community Participation in District Musrenbang

In this research, there are two indicators which is used to measure community participation in Sumbermanjing Wetan District Musrenbang. The first indicator is the activeness of the respondent to provide feedback on proposals in District Musrenbang. The second indicator is the activeness of the respondent to give approval on District Musrenbang's result. Briefly, the respondents' answers regarding community participation's indicator are presented in Table 6.

Table 6. Recapitulation of Community Participation's Indicator

Indicator	Strongly Accept	Accept	Not Accept	Strongly Not Accept	Average
Provide feedback on proposals	6.00%	85.70%	7.10%	1.2%	2.96
Give approval on Musrenbang's result	7.10%	89.30%	3.60%	-	3.04

Source: Processed Primary Data (2015)

Each indicator has different loading factor value. Table 7 presents the contribution of participation variable measuring indicator. Based on the loading factor presented in Table 7, the participation variable measuring model is notated as following:

$Y1 = 0.848$ participation;

$Y2 = 0.900$ participation.

Table 7. Contribution of Participation Variable Measuring Indicators

Variable	Item	Loading Factor
Community participation in development planning	Y1	0.848
	Y2	0.900

Source: SmartPLS Output (2015)

Based on the path coefficient, the model of this research is notated as follows: $Y = 0.111 X_1 - 0.178 X_2 + 0.211 X_3 + 0.054 X_4 + 0.227 X_5 + 0.199 X_6$.

Exogenous variable which has the highest path coefficient is the strongest and most dominant exogenous variable in influencing the endogenous variable. Based on the above equation, the exogenous variable with the highest path coefficient value is perception variable. Therefore, perception has the most powerful influence on community participation in District Musrenbang. The Semi Structured Path Diagram resulted from PLS analysis is depicted in Figure 2.

Source: SmartPLS Output (2015)

Figure 2. Path Diagram of Structural Equation

5. Conclusion

Based on the findings, the conclusions are:

1. The level of community participation in Sumbermanjing Wetan District Musrenbang is in the fifth rung of Arnstein's Ladder of Participation namely placation. This rung indicates the degree of tokenism.
2. Culture positively and significantly influences community participation in District Musrenbang.
3. Educational level negatively and significantly predisposes community participation in District Musrenbang.
4. Income positively and significantly predisposes community participation in District Musrenbang.
5. Length of stay does not significantly predispose community participation in District Musrenbang.

6. Perception positively and significantly predisposes community participation in District Musrenbang.
7. Communication positively and significantly predisposes community participation in District Musrenbang.

Appendix 1

Result of Significance Test

Exogenous Variable	Endogenous Variable	T-Statistics	T-Table	Explanation
Culture	Participation	1.972	1.96	Significant
Educational Level	Participation	4.638	1.96	Significant
Income	Participation	2.741	1.96	Significant
Length of Stay	Participation	1.030	1.96	Not Significant
Perception	Participation	3.971	1.96	Significant
Communication	Participation	2.823	1.96	Significant

Source: SmartPLS Output (2015)

Appendix 2

Path Coefficients

Exogenous Variable	Endogenous Variable	Path Coefficient
Culture	Participation	0.110
Educational Level	Participation	-0.178
Income	Participation	0.211
Length of Stay	Participation	0.054
Perception	Participation	0.227
Communication	Participation	0.199

Source: SmartPLS (2015)

References

- Abe, Alexander. 2002. *Perencanaan Daerah Partisipatif*. Pondok Edukasi. Solo.
- Ariantara, Yudi. 2014. *Analisis Partisipasi Masyarakat terhadap Perencanaan Pembangunan di Kecamatan Pondok Kelapa Kabupaten Bengkulu Tengah*. Magister Tesis Universitas Bengkulu. Bengkulu.
- Conyers, Diana. 1991. *Perencanaan Sosial di Dunia Ketiga*. UGM. Yogyakarta.Press.
- _____. 1994. *Perencanaan Sosial di Dunia Ketiga: Suatu Pengantar*. Gadjah Mada University Press. Yogyakarta.
- Cornwall, Andrea. 2008. *Unpacking 'Participation': Models, Meanings and Practices*. Community

Development Journal Vol 43 No 3 July 2008: 269–283.

Policing Program in Malaysia. Journal of Applied Sciences 14 (20): 2439-2449.

- Girsang, Lisbet Juwita. 2011. *Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Kegiatan Perbaikan Prasarana Jalan (Kasus: Program Nasional Pemberdayaan Masyarakat (PNPM) Mandiri Perdesaan di Desa Megamendung, Bogor)*. Magister Tesis Institut Pertanian Bogor. Bogor.
- Indrayati, Rita. 2013. *Faktor-faktor yang Mempengaruhi Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Pelayanan Kesehatan di Pusat Kesehatan Masyarakat Tembilahan Hulu Kabupaten Indragiri Hilir*. Tesis Magister Administrasi Publik. Universitas Terbuka.
- Kamuiru, J. Kariuki and H. Mbwise. 2014. *Factors Influencing Community Participation in Project Planning in Kenya. A Case Study of Mbucana Water Dam Project, Kiambu County*. The Strategic Journal of Business and Change Management Vol. 2 (29): 54-59.
- Kartasasmita, Ginanjar. 1997. *Administrasi Pembangunan*. LP3ES. Jakarta.
- Mubiyarto. 1984. *Pembangunan Pedesaan*. P3PK UGM. Yogyakarta.
- Perry, James L. 1989. *Handbook of Public Administration*. Jossey-Bass Publishers. San Francisco.
- Riyadi and Bratakusumah, D.S. 2004. *Perencanaan Pembangunan Daerah*. PT. Gramedia Pustaka Utama. Jakarta.
- Sebayang, M.A. 2005. *Hubungan Tingkat Pendidikan dan Pendapatan Dengan Partisipasi Masyarakat Dalam Pengelolaan Lingkungan Hidup di Kisaran Barat Kabupaten Asahan*. Tesis Magister Pendidikan Kependudukan dan Lingkungan Hidup. Universitas Negeri Medan.
- Sidek, N.Z. 2012. *A Ladder of Citizen Participation: Journal Review*. University Teknologi Mara: 3.
- Slamet, Y. 1994. *Pembangunan Masyarakat Berwawasan Partisipasi*. Universitas Sebelas Maret Press. Surakarta.
- Strange, Tracey and Bayley, Anne. 2008. *Sustainable Development Linking Economy, Society, Environment*. OECD Publishing. Paris.
- Sulaiman, Abdul Hadi et. al. 2014. *Determinants of Community Participation in Community*
- Suroso, Hadi. 2014. *Faktor-Faktor Yang Mempengaruhi Partisipasi Masyarakat dalam Perencanaan Pembangunan di Desa Banjaran Kecamatan Driyorejo Kabupaten Gresik*. Wacana UB 17 (1): 7-15.
- Tjokrowinoto, Moeljarto. 1999. *Pembangunan: Dilema dan Tantangan*. Pustaka Pelajar. Yogyakarta.
- Todaro, Michael P. and Stephen C. Smith. 2006. *Economic Development*. Pearson Education. New Jersey.