Farmers satisfaction level on broiler partnership system in Tompobulu District, Maros Regency, South Sulawesi Province, Indonesia
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Abstract. In Maros Regency, many broiler companies are now causing company competition to attract farmers to become partner farmers in the company. In addition, the company must also be able to maintain the breeders to remain in partnership, not to stop, let alone move to a competing company. Therefore, companies as the core must be able to provide satisfactory services to farmers to remain partnered and loyal to the company. The purpose of this study was to determine the level of farmer satisfaction with the broiler partnership system. As many as 60 farmers were chosen to carry out the business partnership system as samples with the stratified random sampling method which was spread in 8 villages in Tompobulu District. Data collection was conducted through interviews. Data were collected using a Likert scale on each measured parameter, namely 1 = dissatisfied, 2 = less satisfied, 3 = satisfied and analyzed descriptively statistically. The results showed that the level of farmer satisfaction with the broiler partnership system based on production facilities services, cultivation technical services, and post-harvest services received by farmers from partner companies were in the satisfied category.

1. Introduction
Development of the livestock sub-sector in the national development stage is expected to become a mainstay component of the source of business growth. The role of broiler farming is felt to be increasingly important in development, proven not only in the supply of animal protein but also in developing the economy of the community. The development of broiler population is directly proportional to the level of public consumption that has increased every year. Demand for chicken meat and eggs will increase along with population growth, income and community education [1].

Broiler is one of the superior commodities of livestock, generally chicken meat consumed by the people of broiler type. The price of chicken meat which is relatively cheaper is one of the factors causing chicken meat to be chosen compared to the price of beef and buffalo meat. In addition, the availability of chicken meat is more than beef, buffalo or goat so that it is more easily obtained by the community. This is supported by the relatively fast harvesting time of broilers which is less than eight weeks so that many farmers are increasingly interested in increasing the scale of broiler farms in the hope of increasing their income.
On the other hand, farmers generally have a high level of dependence on day old chick (DOC) providers, feed, and other production inputs. In addition there are several weaknesses and limitations inherent in farmers including limited capital, skill, market access and weak ability to predict a very volatile market at any time. This condition causes the plasma farmers to be in a weak position, especially in their bargaining position against the DOC price, animal feed and the price of chickens produced so that the farmers carry out a partnership system. The thing that is considered by the breeders to do a partnership system is to get capital assistance, minimize the risk of losses and increase profits. Plasma farmers do not have to spend major costs such as procurement of livestock production facilities and medicines. Farmers simply order during the production period, and calculations will be made at the end of the period so that the plasma farmers are only obliged to provide cages.

The challenges and weaknesses faced by the breeders become a business opportunity for broiler farmer production facilities to conduct business partnerships. This livestock company acts as the core that provides production facilities for farmers as plasma. The purpose of the partnership is so that both parties both the core company and the plasma breeder get mutual benefit. The meaning of mutual benefits here does not mean that both parties in the partnership must have the same capabilities and strengths, but more importantly is the existence of equal bargaining positions based on their respective roles. The characteristics of business partnerships to the reciprocal sharing of risks and proportional profits and this is the strength and character of business partnerships.

In Maros Regency, many poultry companies are implementing a partnership system with farmers, causing competition to attract farmers to become plasma farmers in the company. In addition, the core company must also be able to maintain the existing plasma farmers in order to remain partnered, not to stop, let alone move to the competing core company. Therefore, companies as the core must be able to provide services and performance that satisfies plasma farmers so that plasma farmers remain partnered and loyal to the company. Poor service and core performance that does not satisfy plasma farmers can cause plasma farmers to stop partnering or move to partner with competitors. The purpose of this study was to determine the level of farmer satisfaction with the broiler partnership system in Tompobulu District, Maros Regency.

2. Material and methods
This research was carried out in Tompobulu District, Maros Regency. As many as 60 farmers were chosen to carry out the business partnership system as a sample using the stratified random sampling method to farmers in 8 villages in Tompobulu district. Data collection was conducted through interviews. Measurement of the level of farmer satisfaction on the broiler partnership system conducted by the core company using a Likert scale on each indicator measured, namely 1 = dissatisfied, 2 = less satisfied, 3 = satisfied and analyzed statistically descriptive [2].

Variable farmer satisfaction on broiler partnership system conducted by the core company, namely:
a. Production facilities service with indicators: (1) the application of DOC contract prices, (2) DOC quality, (3) feed contract prices, (4) feed quality, (5) prices of medicines and vaccines, (6) quality of medicines and vaccines and (7) delivery schedule for production facilities.

Variable measurement of service production facilities with 7 indicators and questions with class ranges are as follows:

Highest score = highest weight x number of respondents x number of questions
               = 1260
Lowest score  = lowest weight x number of respondents x number of questions
               = 420
Class Range   = Highest score - Lowest score
               = 1260 - 420 = 280
               Number of Classes
               = 3
From these values can be made the following categories:
Satisfied = 980 – 1260
Less satisfied = 700 – 980
Dissatisfied = 420 – 700

b. Cultivation technical services with indicators: (1) frequency of technical guidance, (2) service and guidance materials, (3) application of production standards, (4) suitability of harvest time, (5) response to all complaints.
Measurement of variable technical service cultivation with 5 indicators and questions with class ranges are as follows:

Highest score = highest weight x number of respondents x number of questions
= 900

Lowest score = lowest weight x number of respondents x number of questions
= 300

Class Range = Highest score - Lowest score
= 900 - 300 = 600

Number of Classes = 120

From these values can be made the following categories:
Satisfied = 700 – 900
Less satisfied = 500 – 700
Dissatisfied = 300 – 500

c. Post-harvest services with indicators: (1) suitability of output prices, (2) giving bonuses, (3) compensation.
Measurement of post-harvest service variables with 3 indicators and questions with class ranges are as follows:

Highest score = highest weight x number of respondents x number of questions
= 540

Lowest score = lowest weight x number of respondents x number of questions
= 180

Class Range = Highest score - Lowest score
= 540 - 180 = 360

Number of Classes = 120

From these values can be made the following categories:
Satisfied = 420 – 540
Less satisfied = 300 – 420
Dissatisfied = 180 – 300

3. Results and discussion
The results of the study interviewed 60 broiler breeders who carried out a partnership system, so that the level of satisfaction of farmers in the partnership system in Tompobulu District, Maros Regency was known as follows:

3.1. Farmer satisfaction level on production facility services
Measurement of the level of satisfaction of plasma farmers for the variable of service facilities for production can be seen in table 1.
Table 1. Level of Satisfaction of Plasma Farmers Towards Production Facility Services.

| Number | Production Facility Services                  | Score | Frequency (Person) | Percentage (%) | Weight (score x frequency) |
|--------|-----------------------------------------------|-------|--------------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| 1.     | Application of DOC contract prices             |       |                    |                |                           |
|        | Satisfied                                     | 3     | 53                | 88.3           | 159                      |
|        | Less satisfied                                | 2     | 7                 | 11.7           | 14                       |
|        | Dissatisfied                                  | 1     | 0                 | 0              | 0                        |
|        | Total                                         | 60    | 100               |                | 173                      |
| 2.     | DOC quality                                   |       |                    |                |                           |
|        | Satisfied                                     | 3     | 55                | 91.7           | 165                      |
|        | Less satisfied                                | 2     | 5                 | 8.3            | 10                       |
|        | Dissatisfied                                  | 1     | 0                 | 0              | 0                        |
|        | Total                                         | 60    | 100               |                | 175                      |
| 3.     | Feed contract price                           |       |                    |                |                           |
|        | Satisfied                                     | 3     | 51                | 85             | 153                      |
|        | Less satisfied                                | 2     | 9                 | 15             | 18                       |
|        | Dissatisfied                                  | 1     | 0                 | 0              | 0                        |
|        | Total                                         | 60    | 100               |                | 171                      |
| 4.     | Feed quality                                  |       |                    |                |                           |
|        | Satisfied                                     | 3     | 54                | 90             | 162                      |
|        | Less satisfied                                | 2     | 6                 | 10             | 12                       |
|        | Dissatisfied                                  | 1     | 0                 | 0              | 0                        |
|        | Total                                         | 60    | 100               |                | 174                      |
| 5.     | Price of drugs and vaccines                   |       |                    |                |                           |
|        | Satisfied                                     | 3     | 52                | 86.7           | 156                      |
|        | Less satisfied                                | 2     | 8                 | 13.3           | 16                       |
|        | Dissatisfied                                  | 1     | 0                 | 0              | 0                        |
|        | Total                                         | 60    | 100               |                | 172                      |
| 6.     | Quality of drugs and vaccines                 |       |                    |                |                           |
|        | Satisfied                                     | 3     | 58                | 96.7           | 174                      |
|        | Less satisfied                                | 2     | 2                 | 3.3            | 4                        |
|        | Dissatisfied                                  | 1     | 0                 | 0              | 0                        |
|        | Total                                         | 60    | 100               |                | 178                      |
| 7.     | Schedule for sending production facilities     |       |                    |                |                           |
|        | Satisfied                                     | 3     | 56                | 93.3           | 168                      |
|        | Less satisfied                                | 2     | 4                 | 6.7            | 8                        |
|        | Dissatisfied                                  | 1     | 0                 | 0              | 0                        |
|        | Total                                         | 60    | 100               |                | 176                      |

Source: Processed Research Results, 2018.

Table 1 shows that the total score measures the level of satisfaction of plasma farmers for the variable production service facilities with the DOC contract pricing indicator, DOC quality, feed contract prices, feed quality, drug and vaccine prices, quality of drugs and vaccines, and production facility delivery schedules 1219 the results of this study mean that they are in the Satisfied Category (980 – 1260).

The results of this study indicate that plasma farmers are satisfied with the production facility services provided by the core company, this is due to the explanation of the contents of the partnership agreement.
related to DOC prices, DOC quality and feed, the price of drugs and vaccines, the quality of drugs and vaccines and the delivery of production facilities already suitable for the plasma farmers. [3], that based on several attributes that are thought to influence the satisfaction of farmers, including those that are in line with the wishes are the application of DOC contract prices, feed quality, drugs and vaccines, and technical guidance provided by the core party. While the attributes that are the main priority that must be corrected are the quality of the DOC. The DOC quality expected by plasma farmers is DOC which has good performance and is more resistant to disease and stress.

3.2. Farmer satisfaction level on cultivation technical services
Measurement of the level of satisfaction of plasma farmers on the variable of technical cultivation service can be seen in table 2.

Table 2. Plasma Farmer Satisfaction Levels on Aquaculture Technical Services

| Number | Cultivation Technical Services | Score | Frequency (Person) | Percentage (%) | Weight (score x frequency) |
|--------|--------------------------------|-------|--------------------|----------------|---------------------------|
| 1.     | Frequency of technical guidance|       |                    |                |                           |
|        | Satisfied                      | 3     | 57                 | 95             | 171                       |
|        | Less satisfied                 | 2     | 3                  | 5              | 6                         |
|        | Dissatisfied                   | 1     | 0                  | 0              | 0                         |
|        | Total                          | 60    | 100                |                | 177                       |
| 2.     | Guidance services and materials|       |                    |                |                           |
|        | Satisfied                      | 3     | 59                 | 98.3           | 177                       |
|        | Less satisfied                 | 2     | 1                  | 1.7            | 2                         |
|        | Dissatisfied                   | 1     | 0                  | 0              | 0                         |
|        | Total                          | 60    | 100                |                | 179                       |
| 3.     | Application of production standards| |                          |                |                           |
|        | Satisfied                      | 3     | 58                 | 96.7           | 174                       |
|        | Less satisfied                 | 2     | 2                  | 3.3            | 4                         |
|        | Dissatisfied                   | 1     | 0                  | 0              | 0                         |
|        | Total                          | 60    | 100                |                | 178                       |
| 4.     | Suitability of harvest time    |       |                    |                |                           |
|        | Satisfied                      | 3     | 55                 | 91.7           | 165                       |
|        | Less satisfied                 | 2     | 5                  | 8.3            | 10                        |
|        | Dissatisfied                   | 1     | 0                  | 0              | 0                         |
|        | Total                          | 60    | 100                |                | 175                       |
| 5.     | Response to any complaints     |       |                    |                |                           |
|        | Satisfied                      | 3     | 56                 | 93.3           | 168                       |
|        | Less satisfied                 | 2     | 4                  | 6.7            | 8                         |
|        | Dissatisfied                   | 1     | 0                  | 0              | 0                         |
|        | Total                          | 60    | 100                |                | 176                       |

Total Score 885

Source: Processed Research Results, 2018.

Table 2 shows that the total score measures the level of satisfaction of plasma farmers for the variable technical service culture with frequency indicators of technical guidance, guidance services and materials, application of production standards, suitability of harvest time, and response to all complaints 885 the results of this study mean that they are in the Satisfied Category (700 – 900).

The results of this study indicate that plasma farmers are satisfied with the cultivation technical services provided by the core company, this is because the core companies have carried out their obligations in the form of guidance and supervision of plasma farmers. [4] reported that the wrong purpose and benefits of the partnership system is to create and enhance the transfer of knowledge, skills,
management, and technology so that it becomes a provision for the community to be able to play a role as a dominant player in the global market.

3.3. Farmer satisfaction level on post harvest services
Measurement of the level of satisfaction of plasma farmers for post-harvest service variables can be seen in table 3.

| Number | Post Harvest Service          | Score | Frequency (Person) | Percentage (%) | Weight (score x frequency) |
|--------|------------------------------|-------|--------------------|----------------|-----------------------------|
| 1.     | Suitability of output prices |       |                    |                |                             |
|        | Satisfied                    | 3     | 56                 | 93.3           | 168                         |
|        | Less satisfied               | 2     | 4                  | 6.7            | 8                           |
|        | Dissatisfied                 | 1     | 0                  | 0              | 0                           |
|        | Total                        | 60    | 100                |                | 176                         |
| 2.     | Giving bonuses               |       |                    |                |                             |
|        | Satisfied                    | 3     | 57                 | 95             | 171                         |
|        | Less satisfied               | 2     | 3                  | 5              | 6                           |
|        | Dissatisfied                 | 1     | 0                  | 0              | 0                           |
|        | Total                        | 60    | 100                |                | 177                         |
| 3.     | Providing compensation      |       |                    |                |                             |
|        | Satisfied                    | 3     | 58                 | 96.7           | 174                         |
|        | Less satisfied               | 2     | 2                  | 3.3            | 4                           |
|        | Dissatisfied                 | 1     | 0                  | 0              | 0                           |
|        | Total                        | 60    | 100                |                | 178                         |

Total Score 531

Source: Processed Research Results, 2018.

Table 3 shows that the total score of measuring the level of satisfaction of plasma farmers in the post-harvest service variable with an indicator of output price suitability, giving bonuses, and providing compensation is 531 the results of this study mean that they are in the Satisfied Category (420 – 540).

The results of this study indicate that plasma farmers are satisfied with the post-harvest services provided by the core companies, this is because the core companies give awards to plasma farmers who excel in the form of bonuses and compensation in the form of money or in the form of study tours or internships. [5,6,7] reported that the greater the scale of the maintenance business, the greater the bonus received by the farmers, the large amount of production also provides a distinct advantage for farmers in terms of calculating incentives. The company gives an award if the farmer achieves an achievement, namely the feed conversion ratio incentive based on the ratio of standard and actual feed conversion ratio. In the partnership pattern of PT. Satwa Indo Perkasa provides bonuses based on the value of feed conversion ratio and mortality rate to plasma farmers if in accordance with existing provisions.

4. Conclusions and recommendations
From the results and discussion, it can be concluded that the level of farmer satisfaction with the broiler partnership system is based on production facilities services, cultivation technical services, and post-harvest services received by plasma farmers from the core companies are in the satisfied category. An open partnership system between core companies and plasma farmers is needed to ensure fairness and work well. The core company as a plasma breeder development company needs to hold regular meetings to discuss complaints of plasma farmers, this is intended to maintain the confidence of plasma farmers in the core companies.
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