

Identification and Development of Innovative Village in Banyumas Regency

By:

Dian Purnomo Jati¹⁾, Agus Suroso²⁾, Lusi Suwandari³⁾

^{1,2,3)}Faculty of Economics and Business, Universitas Jenderal Soedirman

¹⁾Email: dyan_pj@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

This research aimed to explore the characteristics of villages in Banyumas Regency that potentially served as an innovative village. The research phase began with focus group discussions to assess the potential of villages using rapid assessment and quantitative analysis of the Analytical Hierarchy Process. The discussion resulted in a list of 22 villages that were screened out through rapid assessment into 7 villages. The results of the focused group discussion also resulted in eight dimensions used as an instrument to select innovative village, namely: (1) empowerment of village potentials innovatively; (2) support of institutional system and village infrastructure; (3) capacity and commitment of rural apparatus; (4) technological accessibility by the community; (5) community participation; (6) tourism potential; (7) agricultural/plantation/forestry potential; and (8) livestock/fishery potential. The results of paired comparisons using AHP selected Kalisari village at Cilongok sub-district as an innovative village.

Keywords: Model, Village, Innovative, Kalisari, Potency.

ABSTRAK

Penelitian ini bertujuan untuk menentukan desa mana di Kabupaten Banyumas yang dikategorikan sebagai desa inovatif. Untuk menilai seberapa inovatif sebuah desa kami melakukan diskusi kelompok (FGD) dengan menggunakan penilaian cepat dan proses analisa bertingkat. Dari diskusi ini diperoleh 7 dari 22 desa yang dijadikan sampel. Hasil dari FGD juga memberikan hasil berupa 8 instrumen yang digunakan untuk menentukan desa inovatif, yaitu: (1) pemberdayaan potensi yang ada di desa secara inovatif; (2) dukungan sistem kelembagaan dan infrastruktur desa; (3) kapasitas dan komitmen aparatur desa; (4) akses kepada teknologi oleh masyarakat; (5) partisipasi masyarakat; (6) potensi pariwisata; (7) potensi pertanian/perkebunan; dan (8) potensi peternakan/perikanan. Hasil yang kami peroleh dari studi ini dengan menggunakan AHP yaitu Desa Kalisari di Kecamatan Cilongok dikategorikan sebagai desa inovatif.

Kata Kunci: Model, Desa, Inovatif, Kalisari.

INTRODUCTION

The failure of top-down economic development along with the challenges arising from the dynamics of globalization leads practitioners and academics to reconsider their development orientation (Pike *et al.*, 2016). As a result, since 1990, a series of innovative, local and bottom-up regional development policies emerged and dominated development practice in various countries. China's success in building its economy to its current strongest and substantial poverty reduction efforts can not be separated from the development efforts of village-scale businesses in 1980's and 1990's (Nam *et al.*, 2010). The study indicated the significant role of local economic development in the rural context in building a nation's competitive advantage.

The government of Banyumas Regency already has a plan to develop innovative village. However, the result of discussion with the partner (Bappeda) indicated that the government of

Banyumas Regency has not been able to decide which village among 331 villages in Banyumas Regency that will be selected to be developed. It has been acknowledged that the selection of these villages is not an easy process, as the village will become a pilot village for other villages to develop. This study is useful as a scientific justification in the selection of innovative village, because the selection process used objective database and subjective opinions of experts, especially apparatus associated with local area development.

Most of the rural development researches published in scientific journals are not only dominated by studies in developed countries but also according to Ward and Brown (2009) that development studies always have debate upon the role of urban centers as driving forces in innovation and growth with surrounding rural area as passive role. Johnson *et al.* (2006) states that rural development researches have tended to place greater emphasis on rural labor supply, commuting, and migration or labor demand issues. This is because the fundamental driving force for economic growth, its decline and change at the local level are the employment and the fundamental unit of spatial economy is the labor market. According to Dax (2014), rural research has shifted its main concern to larger scope that not always related to agriculture issue. Today rural research highlighted the importance of spatial dynamics and territorial dimension that involves activity to promote social inclusion and poverty reduction.

From the applied perspective, this study plays an important role in supporting the Central Java Provincial Government program which pioneers the development of innovative village. In this context, this study assists local government in determining which village to be developed and assists in providing an instrument that can be used to select the village to be developed into the next innovative village. The objectives of our research is as follows:

- (1) To identify potential resources and readiness of existing villages in Banyumas Regency to be developed as innovative village through rapid assessment.
- (2) To prepare an instrument for measuring the village readiness to be developed into innovative village.
- (3) To determine the village to be pilot project of innovative village

RESEARCH METHOD

The Research and Development Board of Central Java Province defines innovative village as a village capable of utilizing village resources in new ways. Based on the definition, so innovative village is an implementation of local economic development (PEL) concept which based its growth on endogenous development, village development relying heavily on the potential of its resources. Innovative village development requires active participation of various elements, such as village and regional institutions, academics (universities), business owners, banking, and research and development institution.

Innovative village is an idea developed by the Research and Development Board of Central Java Provincial Government in developing its local economy. The core idea of rural development is similar to that developed by the United Nation in Africa. Carr (2008) states that Millenium Village Project (MVP) is an effort undertaken by UN Millenium project to develop facilities at village level to meet the Millenium Development Goals (MDGs). This activity is described as an integrated community level development strategy to eradicate rural poverty using bottom-up approach.

The MVP was enacted using three principles: integrated rural development approach, incremental donor investment, and community based delivery. MVP requires active community engagement. Rural communities are encouraged to frame the issues of concern to the MDG framework. framing cross-village issues will further encourage the emergence of intervention design to achieve a set of common goals and as a potential method to bring these issues at the national level. Thus, it will influence policy makers at the national level within the framework of millenium development goals (MDGs).

The 1970s period was a milestone of change in development orientation with policy transformation in regional development planning. Under this new direction, general policy has shifted to poverty reduction and employment, and has provided greater priority to rural development (Ngah

et al., 2012). In this regard, new strategies are formulated as part of the development of rural areas with an emphasis on integrated rural development. One of the strategies is rural strengthening within the framework of regional development planning by introducing the Traditional Village Development Approach in Malaysia (Ngah *et al.*, 2012).

Village development studies are also related to cultural aspects. The development of rural areas according to Hribar and Lozej (2013) must take into account the role of cultural and natural values. The culture itself is not a key to sustainable development, but culture has the potential to produce a community capable of managing its own entity. This is possible because the cultural strategy introduces new meanings into the daily activities of the community. Nam *et al.* (2010) identifies the existence of two interrelated innovations contributing to the industrial development of the village, namely production of high quality products for export markets and adoption of a vertically integrated production system. Rural development efforts need to be well managed at every stage, from the planning, implementation, to evaluation.

The approach used is mix method using qualitative and quantitative data. This approach is chosen by the researcher with a consideration to produce a development model, so that it requires exploratory study. By using mixed method, the researcher can achieve convergence of collected data and enrich the descriptions to improve the credibility of research findings.

The population of this research consists of village community and village apparatus, competent apparatus at official level in Banyumas Regency (Bappeda, Disperindagkop, Dinpertanhutbun, Disnakan), PNPM. Primary data needed are (1) data of respondent responses from related department through rapid assessment, (2) data of respondent responses from village community, village apparatus, sub-district, related department in the form of responses to questionnaires, in-depth interview transcript, and focus group discussion, and (3) field observation data about potential, area condition and village economy. Secondary data needed are (1) document of the direction of development policy of Banyumas Regency areas and (2) document of cross-department activities conducted and related to the village development.

Primary data collection was performed through focus group discussion with the Regional Development Planning Board (Bappeda) and other related departments, and field survey. While secondary data collection was performed through literature review in government institutions, namely Bappeda, Disperindagkop, Dinpertanhutbun, and Disnakan.

Quantitative data is processed using rapid assessment and analytical hierarchy process. Qualitative data is processed by data reduction, data display and data categorization methods based on comparative analysis method. Processed data is presented in the form of narrative text, that is a systematic, logical and rational description according to the order of importance of the data

RESULT AND DISCUSSION

Identification of Resource Potential and Villages Readiness

Focus group discussion was conducted by inviting LGUs in the relevant Banyumas Regency government. Rapid assessment was conducted in the villages proposed by FGD participants and they agreed to propose 22 villages to be analyzed further, the villages were in Table 1. Furthermore, from the villages list proposed by FGD participants, it was conducted rapid assessment summarized in Table 2 (a, b, and c).

Table 1. Proposed Villages in Focus Group Discussion

No.	Village	Sub-District
1.	Kalitapen	Purwojati
2.	Kejawar	Banyumas
3.	Kemiri	Sumpiuh
4.	Limpakuwus	Sumbang
5.	Kalisari	Cilongok
6.	Gumelar	Gumelar

7.	Sokawera	Cilongok
8.	Kalisalak	Kebasen
9.	Alasmalang	Kemranjen
10.	Baseh	Kedungbanteng
11.	Beji	Kedungbanteng
12.	Papringan	Banyumas
13.	Sokaraja Kulon	Sokaraja
14.	Kemutug	Baturraden
15.	Karangtengah	Cilongok
16.	Kemawi	Somagede
17.	Kel. Pasir Kidul	West Purwokerto
18.	Karanggintung	Kemranjen
19.	Tambaknegara	Rawalo
20.	Pancasan	Ajibarang
21.	Pekaja	Sokaraja
22.	Gununglurah	Cilongok

Source: Primary Data

Table 2 (a). Rapid Assessment of Potential Villages

Dimension	Village							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
Empowerment of village potentials innovatively	3.7	2.3	2.3	4.7	8.3	7.3	6	7.3
Support of institutional system and village infrastructure	5	4	3.3	6	7	6.3	5.7	6.7
Capacity and commitment of village apparatus	5.3	4.7	4.0	5.7	7.7	6.7	5	6.3
Technological accessibility by the community	3.0	3.0	2.7	3.7	7.7	5	4.7	3.3
Community participation	3.3	3.0	2.7	5.3	8	5.7	6	7.3
Tourism potential	2.3	2.3	2.3	6	8	2.3	4.3	7
Agriculture/plantation/forestry potentials	3.7	3.7	3.7	7	7.3	6.3	7.7	7.7
Livestock/fishery potentials	2.0	2.0	2.0	4.7	5	7.7	7	7.3
Total	3.54	3.13	2.88	5.4	7.4	5.9	5.8	6.6

Source: Primary Data

Preparation of Measurement Instrument of Village Readiness to be Developed into Innovative Village

The process of instrument preparation is a series one-way discussions conducted with Bappeda of Banyumas Regency as a facilitator. The eight components agreed by one-way discussion participants are presented in Table 3.

Table 2 (b). Rapid Assessment of Potential Villages

Dimension	Village							
	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
Empowerment of village potentials innovatively	3.7	3.7	8	3.7	8	4.3	4.0	2.7
Support of institutional system and village infrastructure	3.3	3.3	5	3.3	7	4.0	3.7	4.3
Capacity and commitment of village apparatus	4.0	4.0	6.3	4.0	5.7	4.7	4.7	5.3
Technological accessibility by the community	2.3	2.3	6.7	2.3	6.7	2.3	2.7	2.7
Community participation	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	7.3	4.0	4.3	3.3
Tourism potential	2.0	7.3	2.3	3.0	6.7	8.0	7.0	4.7

Agriculture/plantation/forestry potentials	7.0	7.0	3.7	5.3	3.3	6.7	6.7	6.0
Livestock/fishery potentials	2.0	1.7	9	1.7	4.3	3.7	3.0	3.0
Total	3.46	4.08	5.5	3.33	6.1	4.71	4.5	4.0

Source: Primary Data

Table 2 (c). Rapid Assessment of Potential Villages

Dimension	Village					
	17	18	19	20	21	22
Empowerment of village potentials innovatively	2.3	2.0	2.7	3.7	3.0	3.7
Support of institutional system and village infrastructure	4.0	4.3	4.3	4.7	5.0	5.3
Capacity and commitment of village apparatus	4.7	4.3	4.3	5.0	5.7	5.7
Technological accessibility by the community	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	5.0	5.3
Community participation	2.7	2.3	2.3	3.7	4.3	5.0
Tourism potential	2.0	1.7	2.7	3.3	2.7	6.0
Agriculture/plantation/forestry potentials	2.3	2.7	2.7	2.3	2.3	7.3
Livestock/fishery potentials	2.3	2.0	2.0	2.7	3.3	2.7
Total	3.08	2.96	3.17	3.71	3.92	5.13

Source: Primary Data

Table 3. Components of Innovative Village Assessment Instrument

No.	Components
1.	Support of institutional system and village infrastructure
2.	Capacity and commitment of village apparatus
3.	Empowerment of village potentials innovatively
4.	Technological accessibility by the community
5.	Community participation
6.	Tourism potential
7.	Agriculture/plantation/forestry potentials
8.	Livestock/fishery potentials

The order of above components in Table 3 does not reflect its importance. Support of institutional system and village infrastructure is an important component according to discussion participants. Institution refers to organization, place and includes behavior in individual and institution in the broad sense. Definition of institution fundamentally refers to a system established to facilitate relationship between people in an effort to achieve common goals. Institutional system referred to in this instrument includes both formal and non-formal definition, so that its assessment is the result of an assessment of aggregate perceptions of individual respondent to the presence of assessed institution in the village.

Capacity and commitment of the village apparatus are a component determining the success of village development. In the context of rural development, the commitment of village leader or village head and Village Consultative Board (BPD) to village development planning, and the ability and willingness of bureaucracy at the village level to support and facilitate development, as well as the capacity of apparatus in coordinating village resources will affect the success rate of development.

Meanwhile, according to Kimani and Kombo (2011), common development in rural area can be achieved by enhancing community participation in development projects. Community participation in rural development involves act of sharing to all community members where every community members is directed to specific goals. Siswanto *et al.* (2017) also elaborated the importance of community participation. They conducted research related to Village Fund (Dana Desa or DD), and found the importance of increasing community participation in form of opening space of participation for the less fortune people or the poor people, increasing authority and control over community's decision will have positive impact to development.

The dimension of tourism potential is considered important because multiplier effect of the tourism sector for the economic activities is extensive. Various studies confirm the association between tourism development and the growth of creative economy in the region. UNDP defines creative economy as part of innovative knowledge, creative use of technology, and culture. Creative industrial sector relies on the power of human innovation in exploiting opportunities. Suparwoko (2010) states that although the creative sector does not produce large quantities of products, it is capable of making a significant positive contribution to the national economy. Although the creative sector generally develops in urban context where the quality of human resources is generally higher, Zaei and Zaei (2013) and Petrevska (2011) state that the creative economy and tourism sector are two things affecting each other, and can synergize when they are well managed. Yozcu and Icoz (2010) explain that creativity will stimulate tourist destinations to create innovative products that will add value and higher competitiveness compared to other tourist destinations. The eighth dimension is related to two sectors that contribute greatly to GRDP, namely agriculture, plantation, and forestry sector and livestock and fishery sector.

Determining Which Village to be a Pilot Project of Innovative Village

Based on the calculation through Analytical Hierarchy Process technique, it can be determined the weight of each dimension summarized as follows:

Table 4. Weight of Each Instrument Dimension

Determining dimension of Innovative Village	Weight	Rank
Support of institutional system and village infrastructure	0.286500499	1
Capacity and commitment of village apparatus	0.107518631	6
Empowerment of village potentials innovatively	0.109074349	5
Technological accessibility by the community	0.077310259	8
Community participation	0.110872434	2
Tourism potential	0.089295246	7
Agriculture/plantation/forestry potentials	0.109714290	3
Livestock/fishery potentials	0.109714290	4
Total		1

Table 4 above shows that the dimension of support of institutional system and village infrastructure is perceived by respondents as the most important dimension in assessing potential village to be developed. The next part of the questionnaire instrument is paired comparison of seven villages on each of the eight instrument dimension. The results of paired comparison are summarized in the Table 5 through Table 12. Based on the calculation of analytical hierarchy process, the village selected as an innovative village was Kalisari village in Cilongok sub-district.

Table 5. Weight of Each Village on Dimension of Institutional System and Village Infrastructure

Determining Dimension of Innovative Village	Alternative village	Weight
Institutional System and Village Infrastructure (0.286500499)	1. Sokaraja Kulon	0.170194
	2. Limpakuwus	0.124402
	3. Kalisari	0.427622
	4. Gumelar	0.120177
	5. Sokawera	0.098581
	6. Kalisalak	0.028324
	7. Beji	0.030700
Total		1

Table 6. Weight of Each Village on Dimension of Capacity and Commitment of Village Apparatus

Determining dimension of Innovative Village	Alternative Village	Weight
Capacity and commitment of village apparatus (0.107518631)	1. Sokaraja Kulon	0.147625
	2. Limpakuwus	0.144494
	3. Kalisari	0.153054
	4. Gumelar	0.146627
	5. Sokawera	0.137108
	6. Kalisalak	0.135351
	7. Beji	0.135742
Total		1

Table 7. Weight of Each Village on Dimension of Empowerment of Village Potentials Innovatively

Determining Dimension of Innovative Village	Alternative Village	Weight
Empowerment of village potentials innovatively (0.109074349)	1. Sokaraja Kulon	0.142558
	2. Limpakuwus	0.137108
	3. Kalisari	0.149106
	4. Gumelar	0.146591
	5. Sokawera	0.134567
	6. Kalisalak	0.146844
	7. Beji	0.143225
Total		1

Table 8. Weight of Each Village on Dimension of Technological Accessibility by the Community

Determining Dimension of Innovative Village	Alternative Village	Weight
Technological accessibility by the community (0.077310259)	1. Sokaraja Kulon	0.143835
	2. Limpakuwus	0.141202
	3. Kalisari	0.149437
	4. Gumelar	0.150297
	5. Sokawera	0.133736
	6. Kalisalak	0.147081
	7. Beji	0.134413
Total		1

Table 9. Weight of Each Village on Dimension of Community Participation

Determining dimension of Innovative Village	Alternative Village	Weight
Community participation (0.110872434)	1. Sokaraja Kulon	0.141508
	2. Limpakuwus	0.138207
	3. Kalisari	0.154098
	4. Gumelar	0.147674
	5. Sokawera	0.136766
	6. Kalisalak	0.149820
	7. Beji	0.131926
Total		1

Table 10. Weight of Each Village on Dimension of Tourism Potential

Determining Dimension of Innovative Village	Alternative Village	Weight
Tourism potential (0.089295246)	1. Sokaraja Kulon	0.147874
	2. Limpakuwus	0.148517
	3. Kalisari	0.153748
	4. Gumelar	0.137459
	5. Sokawera	0.137405
	6. Kalisalak	0.144379
	7. Beji	0.130618
Total		1

Table 11. Weight of Each Village on Dimension of Agriculture, Plantation, Forestry Potentials

Determining Dimension of Innovative Village	Alternative Village	Weight
Agriculture, plantation, forestry potentials (0.10971429)	1. Sokaraja Kulon	0.147874
	2. Limpakuwus	0.148517
	3. Kalisari	0.153748
	4. Gumelar	0.137459
	5. Sokawera	0.137405
	6. Kalisalak	0.144379
	7. Beji	0.130618
Total		1

Table 12. Weight of Each Village on Dimension of Livestock and Fishery Potentials

Determining Dimension of Innovative Village	Alternative Village	Weight
Livestock and fishery potentials (0.10971429)	1. Sokaraja Kulon	0.129660
	2. Limpakuwus	0.137594
	3. Kalisari	0.147433
	4. Gumelar	0.150807
	5. Sokawera	0.141063
	6. Kalisalak	0.139253
	7. Beji	0.154189
Total		1

Exploring Potential of Selected Village (Kalisari Village) through Field Study

A field survey was conducted on 25 respondents considered to represent public opinion. The selection of respondents was conducted using convenience sampling by taking into account the respondents background. Thus, it was expected to be able to describe the collective opinion. The sampling did not take into account to the principle of statistical representation because based on observation and information on research subject, the community of Kalisari village had local characteristics of following the leader opinion and seeking to achieve harmony in the community for the collective interest.

The background of respondents was dominated by entrepreneurs/tofu producers by 17 people because Kalisari Village is a center of tofu, the majority of population depends on tofu production for their livelihood. While the remaining 8 people had jobs ranging from civil servant and private employee. The respondent's responses are tabulated in the following Table 13.

Table 13. Respondent's Response of Kalisari Village

No	Attitude	Amount	Percentage
1.	Support	24	96
2.	Does not give opinion	1	4
3.	Does not support	0	0

Source: Primary Data

Table 13 above shows the amount of support from the sample of Kalisari Village community to realize an innovative village. Some respondents expressed their hope to realize an innovative village, so that the community economy dominated by SMEs will be empowered. The respondents also expressed their hope to develop Curug Cipendok tourist attraction located in Karang Tengah Village in the north of Kalisari Village, so that the benefits can be gained by both Kalisari and Karang Tengah Villages.

Although some respondents were not fully informed about innovative village, they believed that the village status will have a positive impact on the community.

CONCLUSION AND SUGGESTION

Dimensions that can be used as a guide in assessing the village potentials to be developed as an innovative village included (1) support of institutional system and village infrastructure, (2) capacity and commitment of village apparatus, (3) empowerment of village potentials innovatively, (4) technological accessibility by the community, (5) community participation, (6) tourism potential, (7) agricultural/plantation/forestry potentials, and (8) livestock/fishery potentials.

Based on the above conclusions, some recommendations to be proposed are: (1) Intensive discussion is needed at the government level (Government of Banyumas Regency), so that all LGUs within government of Banyumas Regency have the same level of commitment and prepare mutually supportive activities program in order to develop innovative village optimally. (2) Communication path between tofu producers and elements of community needs to be reopened, so that solutions to various community and business problems can be found.

REFERENCES

- Carr, E.R. (2008). The millenium village project and African development: Problems and potentials. *Progress in Development Studies*, 4, 333-344.
- Dax, T. (2014). Shaping rural development research in Europe: acknowledging the interrelationships between agriculture, regional, and ecological development. *Studies in Agricultural Economics*, 116, 59-66.
- Hribar, M.S. and Lozej, S.L. (2013). The role of identification and management of cultural values at development of rural areas. *Acta geographica Slovenia*, 53-2. 372-378.
- Johnson, T., Otto, D. and Deller, S. (2006). *Community policy analysis modeling systems: 'COMPAS'*. Ames, Iowa: Blackwell Professional Publishing.
- Kimani, E.N. and Kombo, D.K. (2011). An Investigation of community participation in the development of schools and income generating projects in rural areas in Kenya. *British Journal of Educational Research*, 1(1), 56-68.
- Nam, V.H., Sonobe, T. and Otsuka, K. (2010). an inquiry into the development process of village industries: The case of a knitwear cluster in Northern Vietnam. *Journal of Development Studies*, 46(2), 312-330.
- Ngah, K., Zakaria, Z., Mustaffa, J. and Noordin, N. (2012). Regional development policies practices in the rural development approach in Malaysia: A case study in Seberang Perai. *Asian Social Science*, 8(11), 186-192.
- Pike, A., Rodriquez-Pose, A. and Tomaney, J. (2016). *Local and regional development 2nd edition*. London, United Kingdom: Taylor & Francis Ltd.
- Petrevska, B. (2011). Tourism in the global development strategy of Macedonia: Economic Perspectives. *UTMS Journal of Economics*, 2(1), 101-108.
- Siswanto, B., Sadhana, K. and Tomo, Yusaq. (2017). Community participation and stakeholders in village fund management. *Journal of Economics and Sustainable Development*. 8(20), 42-47.

- Suparwoko. (2010). Development of creative economy as a driver for the tourism industry. The Paper was presented on National Symposium 2010: Towards Dynamic and Creative Purworejo.
- Ward, N. and Brown, D. (2009). Placing the rural in regional development. *Regional Studies*, 43(10), 1237-1244.
- Yozcu, O. and Icoz, O. (2010). A model proposal on the use of creative tourism experiences in congress tourism and the congress marketing mix. *PASOS*, 8(3).
- Zaei, M.E., and Zaei, M. E. (2013). The impacts of tourism industry on host community. *European Journal of Tourism Hospitality and Research*, 1(2), 12-21.