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Abstract. This study aims to analyze the level of community participation in local economic development in Makalu Village, Posumaen District, Southeast Minahasa Regency. The sample used in this study was 30 respondents taken randomly. Respondents are local economic actors in Makalu Village. Measurement of the level of community participation in regional economic development (LED) is based on the participation ladder proposed by Arnstein (1969). Analysis of Arnstein's degree of participation, using the scoring method in determining the level of participation using variables (1) degree of communication, (2) public knowledge of the decision making process, (3) community control over planning policies. The results showed the level of community participation for the communication aspect was at the consultation level. The public knowledge aspect of the decision-making process and the control aspect of public policy was at the level of anger reduction/placation. Overall the level of community participation in the development of the local economy participation ladder is at the level of tokenism / just a justification so that the community is not offended or feels unrecognized.

1. Introduction

Development policies that are deemed appropriate and strategic in regional development in Indonesia are the local economy. Local economic growth is a regional development policy that is based on the development of sectors, which are the priority pursued in the financial activities of local communities [1].

The concept of regional development based on the local economy is a concept of development based on growing local capacity (endogenous growth). The main principle of implementing local economic development (LED) is a partnership. The cooperation between the regional government, the private sector, and the community strongly determines the success and sustainability of the LED program in an area.

Local economic development is closely related to the empowerment of its human resources, institutions, and the surrounding environment. To develop the local economy is not enough to improve the ability of human resources, but also the need for institutions that are trained to manage advanced human resources and require a conducive environment to enable local economic institutions to develop. The development of the local economy through the development of partner institutions for all stakeholders (government, business, and community) thus requires communication skills among all relevant institutions that guarantee the sustainability of business partners and business partners [2].

Southeast Minahasa Regency has begun to spur development through leading sectors in the region. Jocom et al. [3] argue the agricultural, forestry and fisheries, mining and quarrying, electricity and gas
procurement, construction sector, transportation, and trade also the real estate sector have the potential
to be developed in Southeast Minahasa Regency. These sectors can stimulate regional economic
growth and development in Southeast Minahasa Regency with the support of appropriate policies. The
success of the development is mostly determined by the involvement or participation of the
community in supporting growth. The purpose of this study was to learn how the level of community
participation/involvement in local economic development in the village of Makalu, Posumaen District,
Southeast Minahasa Regency.

2. Methods

2.1. Place and time of research
The study was conducted in Makalu Village, Posumaen District, Southeast Minahasa Regency. The
study was conducted from May to June 2019 from data collection in the field to the preparation of the
final report.

2.2. Data source
The data used in this study used primary data and secondary data. Primary data was obtained through
direct observation in the field and direct interviews with respondents using a questionnaire. Respondents are farmers, RT-scale local economic actors and private businesses as well as all relevant
stakeholders in Southeast Minahasa Regency. Secondary data, i.e. data obtained from related agencies
such as BPS [4], the Agriculture Service, Bappeda, the Infrastructure and Settlement Office and other
relevant agencies that have been available in the form of documents and literature studies.

2.3. Sample collection method
The sample used in this study was 30 respondents taken randomly (random sampling). Respondents
are local economic actors in Makalu Village, Posumaen District, Southeast Minahasa Regency.

2.4. Analysis Method
Measurement of the level of community participation in local economic development (LED) is based
on the participation ladder proposed by Arnstein (1969). Analysis of Arnstein's degree of participation,
using the scoring method in determining the level of participation using variables (1) degree of
communication, (2) public knowledge of the decision making process, (3) community control over
planning policies.
1. The variables used to measure the degree of communication are:
2. 1. Information: Did you get information about the implementation of the Local Economic
Development (LED) program?
3. 2. Decision-making forum: In what forum decisions are made in the village environment.
4. 3. The number of people participating: What percentage do you think are people who know and
are consulted about a project that will take place in your environment (LED)?
5. 4. Interventions by the authorities: how much is the intervention of the authorities in the LED
program facilitation process?
The variables used to measure the degree of public knowledge in the decision-making process are:
1. Participatory concept: Do you think that the planning in the village (in the development of the
Local Economy) has involved the community?
2. Level of satisfaction: Are you satisfied with the procedures and decision-making process in
planning local economic development?
3. Method for participation: Do you think that in the planning of regional economic development
carried out so far, residents and community organizations know the procedures (procedures) to get
involved in it?
4. Level of participation in groups: If decisions are made in groups, how are decisions made?
The variables used to measure community control over development policies are:
1. Access to planning forums: Can residents and other community organizations quickly get involved / participate in local economic development forums?
2. Criticism of the planning forum mechanism: Have you ever given input to the government or parties that you think are responsible for changing the procedures and decision-making process?
3. Community involvement in project implementation: What do you think is community involvement in the implementation of local economic programs?

### Table 1. Aspects and levels in assessing participation degrees according to Arnstein

| Aspect                          | Level                          | Interval | Assessment Score |
|---------------------------------|-------------------------------|----------|------------------|
| A. Communication                | There is no communication     | 30       | 1                |
|                                 | One-way communication but only a few public decisions can be clarified | 52.5 75 | 2                |
|                                 | Communication is sufficient, but it is still one-way | 75 97.5 | 3                |
|                                 | There is dialogue             | 97.5 120| 4                |
| B. Public knowledge of the decision-making process | Do not know | 30 52.5 | 1                |
|                                 | Know                          | 52.5 75 | 2                |
|                                 | Influence                     | 75 97.5 | 3                |
|                                 | Play a big role               | 97.5 120| 4                |
| C. Community control over public policy | There is no | 30 52.5 | 1                |
|                                 | Can only comment (less control power) | 52.5 75 | 2                |
|                                 | Can give criticism and input (Has power) | 75 97.5 | 3                |
|                                 | Can control completely (control power) | 97.5 120| 4                |

The stages of calculating the three variables are carried out by:
1. Scoring with a scale of 1-4 (s)
2. Calculating the frequency distribution (f)
3. Give weight to the assessment of variables based on the influence of variables on the aspects assessed (b)
4. Find quartiles based on the calculation of s x f x b by subtracting the highest value (if all have the most upper scale) and the lowest value (if all choose the smallest scale).
5. Comparing the results with the Arnstein index

### Table 2. Degree of Participation According to Arnstein

| Level Participation          | Factor Value | Index | Group        |
|------------------------------|--------------|-------|--------------|
|                              | A    | B    | C    |               |
| Community Oversight          | 4    | 4    | 4    | 12            | Community |
| Delegation of Power          | 4    | 3-4  | 3    | 10-11         | Authority |
| Partnership                  | 4    | 3    | 2-3  | 9-10          | Level     |
| Anger Reduction              | 4    | 2-3  | 2-3  | 8-9           | Tokenism  |
| Consultation                 | 3-4  | 2    | 2    | 7-8           | level     |
| Submit information           | 2-3  | 1-2  | 1-2  | 7-8           |           |
| Therapy                      | 2    | 1    | 1    | 4             | Non-      |
| Manipulation                 | 1    | 1    | 1    | 3             | Participation |

Source: Arnstein 1969

A = Communication
B = Public Knowledge of the decision-making process
C = Community Control over public policy
3. Results and discussion

Community participation in the development process is a manifestation of the community’s response to existing problems and is carried out in a way that is acceptable to the community. Community is active in development means giving responsibility to formulate the problems that exist in the community, mobilize local resources, and develop local community organizing groups. The positive impact of this participation process is that the community can understand the problems that arise as well as understand the final decision taken. Furthermore, community participation according to Cofen and Uphoff (1977) in Harahap [5] is community involvement in the decision making process about what will be done and how, involvement in implementing programs and decisions in contributing resources or cooperating in particular organizations or activities, sharing the benefits of application and participation in program evaluation. Based on the above definition, the expected participation in development is interactive participation and the mobilization of initiatives or participation in the form of partnerships, the delegation of power, and supervision by the community.

Community participation in supporting local economic development is realized both individually and in groups. Individually, the farmers participated by participating in every activity related to local economic development programs through the implementation of appropriate technology and the use of superior seeds in farming so that there was an increase in productivity. Institutionally, through a combination of farmer groups, is the occurrence of exchange of information between fellow farmer groups related to farming and price information as well as local economic development efforts.

The level of community participation related to local economic development. It is seen from communication, community knowledge in the decision-making process, and measuring community control over development policies. The results of the analysis for each variable can be seen in the table below.

3.1. Communication aspect

Table 4 shows that from 30 research respondents, 63.33 percent were aware of information about local economic development, and 36.67 percent did not know information related to local economic development. This shows that the local economic development program is known by the community in Makalu Village, Posumaen District, Southeast Minahasa Regency. Local economic development programs have become a topic discussed in farmer groups in the village environment. Community participation in communication for local economic development is also quite high, where almost 50 percent of the community is involved in local economic development programs. The analysis shows that the intervention of the apparatus is still quite dominant. This is indicated by 46.66 percent of respondents who stated that the community was instructed by the government through agricultural extension activities or village and sub-district level officials. Community activities are activities that are synchronized with government programs, including local economic development programs. Limited human resources (HR), both education and expertise, is one of the reasons for this. The community only runs programs that are rolled out by the government activities originating from the wishes of the population are still not widely appointed to become programs by the government. This indicates that the Musrembang process has not been genuinely effective, still at the level of ritual.

| No | Aspect | Score (S) | Frequency (F) | Weight (B) % | S x F x B | % |
|----|--------|-----------|---------------|--------------|-----------|---|
| A  | Communication Aspects | | | | | |
| 1  | Did you get information about the program local economic development | 1 | 11 | 0.3 | 3.3 | 36.67 |
|    | a. No | 1 | 11 | 0.3 | 3.3 | 36.67 |
|    | b. Yes | 4 | 9 | 0.3 | 22.8 | 63.33 |
| 2  | In what forum are decisions made in the village environment | | | | | |
|    | | 26.1 | | | | |

Table 3. Results of Analysis of Communication Aspects
According to you how many people know and are invited to confer regarding a project that will take place in the environment you (a.l. Local Economic Development)

- a. Under 10 %
- b. Between 10 - 30 %
- c. Between 30 - 50 %
- d. More than 50 %

How big is the intervention of the apparatus in the facilitation process Program?

- a. Very dominant
- b. Dominant
- c. Not too dominant
- d. Not Dominant

Source: Primary Data, Results of Analysis (2019)

3.2. The Community Knowledge Aspect of the Decision Making Forum

Table 5 shows from 30 research respondents, 80 percent said that local economic development had involved the community. This indicates the people of Makalu Village have contributed to the implementation of local economic development. The community knows the procedures and procedures for engaging in regional economic development and is satisfied with the decisions made in planning at the group level. The decision-making process at the group level is carried out through deliberations to reach consensus. This situation is possible because the communication process related to the local economic development program has been well socialized. The socialization of regional economic development programs is carried out both individually in the community and through farmer groups. This is in line with the results of research from Daniels et al. [6] that participation is not a natural process, but through a learning process of socialization that is at the planning stage.

Table 4. Results of Analysis of Public Knowledge of Decision Making Forums

| No | Aspect | Score (S) | Frequency (F) | Weight (B) % | S x F x B % |
|----|--------|-----------|---------------|-------------|-------------|
| B  | Public Knowledge of Decision-Making Forums | 1  | 6 | 0.25 | 1.5 | 20 |
| 1  | In your opinion, whether there is planning in the development program the local economy has involved the community (already reflecting participatory concept) | 4  | 24 | 0.25 | 24 | 80 |
| 2  | Are you satisfied with the procedure and the taking process Decisions in the LED planning forum? | 1  | 4 | 0.25 | 1 | 13.33 |
|    | a. Not satisfied | 2  | 10 | 0.25 | 5 | 33.33 |
|    | b. less satisfied | 3  | 16 | 0.25 | 12 | 53.33 |
|    | c. Satisfied | 4  | - | - | - | - |
|    | d. Very satisfied | 18  | -  | -  | -  | -  |
In your opinion whether in development planning development (PEL) which has been carried out so far, residents and community organizations know the procedures (procedures) for getting involved inside it.

a. Do not know  
   Value: 1  Frequency: 6  Weight: 0.3  Total: 1.8

b. Know but only a little  
   Value: 2  Frequency: 6  Weight: 0.3  Total: 3.6

c. Know and get involved  
   Value: 3  Frequency: 14  Weight: 0.3  Total: 4.2

b. Very know and involved  
   Value: 4  Frequency: 4  Weight: 0.3  Total: 4.8

If the decision is taken in a group, how is that decision make?

a. Determined by the chairman only  
   Value: 1  Frequency: 3  Weight: 0.2  Total: 0.6

b. Discussed in groups but the final outcome is determined by chairman  
   Value: 2  Frequency: 8  Weight: 0.2  Total: 3.2

b. Discussed and determined by a portion of the forum  
   Value: 3  Frequency: -  Weight: -  Total: -

b. Discussed and the results determined by the entire forum  
   Value: 4  Frequency: 19  Weight: 0.2  Total: 15.2

Total 85.3

Source: Primary Data, Results of Analysis (2019)

3.3. Policy control aspects

Table 6. Shows community control over policies. The analysis shows that although the community has been involved in planning and implementing local economic development, community access to policy control is still very limited. This is indicated by the limited input or input from the community towards the government related to local economic development programs. So the community’s feedback on proposals for program improvement is still not accommodated. Community involvement is still at the level of program planning and implementation, but it has not yet touched on intervention or control over policy implementation.

Table 5. Results of Analysis of Control Aspects of Policy

| No | Aspect                                                                 | Score | Frekuensi (S) | Weight (B) | S x F x B | % |
|----|-----------------------------------------------------------------------|-------|---------------|------------|-----------|---|
| C  | Control of Policies                                                   |       |               |            |           |   |
| 1  | What citizens and other community organizations can with easy to get involved/participate in planning forums |       |               |            |           |   |
| a. | Very difficult                                                       | 1     | -             | -          | -         |   |
| b. | Difficult                                                            | 2     | 1             | 0.3        | 0.6       | 3.33 |
| c. | Easy                                                                 | 3     | 27            | 0.3        | 24.3      | 90  |
| d. | Very easy                                                            | 4     | 2             | 0.3        | 2.4       | 6.67 |
|    |                                                                       |       |               |            |           | 27.3|
| 2  | Have you ever given input to the government or the party that you think is responsible for changing the procedure and decision-making process |       |               |            |           |   |
| a. | Never                                                                | 1     | 11            | 0.4        | 4.4       | 36.67|
| b. | Never and did not get a response                                     | 2     | 3             | 0.4        | 2.4       | 10  |
In your opinion, how is the community involvement in implementation of the LED program

|        | a. Not good | b. Pretty good | c. Well | d. Very good |
|--------|-------------|----------------|---------|--------------|
| Score  | 1           | 2              | 3       | 4            |
| 1.     | 1           | 9              | 0.4     | 10.8         |
| 2.     | 2           | 9              | 0.4     | 11.2         |
| 3.     | 3           | 16             | 0.3     | 14.4         |
| 4.     | 4           | 4              | 0.3     | 4.8          |
| Total  |             |                |         | 24.9         |

Source: Primary Data, results of analysis (2019)

It was found the total score for the communication aspect was 81.1 aspects of public knowledge of the decision-making forum was 85.3, and the control of public policy was 81. Furthermore, by comparing the total score with Arnstein's participation, it was found that the assessment score for each aspect was 3 (three) for the communication aspect. This shows that the communication aspect is at the consultation level based on Arnstein's degree of participation. Consultation implies that in aspects related to communication, two-way communication occurs with the community. The people's aspirations are heard, but the advice given by the community is not always used. Ahmad [7] argues, participation at the consultative level can be caused by institutional rigidity in the planning forum, where the experience causes the organization to experience stiffness in responding to change. Changes in the concept or paradigm of participatory planning today are not followed by changes in the organization in applying the idea. The organization is still carrying out old habits or has not experienced changes according to changes in the existing paradigm.

Table 6. Total Score of Participation Degree Analysis Results

| No | Aspect                                      | Variable                                      | Total Score |
|----|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-------------|
| 1. | Communication                               | • Information                                 | 81.1        |
|    |                                             | • Decision-making forum                        |             |
|    |                                             | • Number of people participating              |             |
|    |                                             | • Interventions by the authorities            |             |
| 2. | Public knowledge of the decision            | • The concept of participation                | 85.3        |
|    | making in forum                             | • Level of satisfaction                       |             |
|    |                                             | • Procedure for participation                 |             |
|    |                                             | • Level of participation in groups            |             |
| 3. | Control of public policy                    | • Access to planning forums                   | 81          |
|    |                                             | • Criticism of the planning forum mechanism   |             |
|    |                                             | • Community involvement in project implementation |    |

Source: Primary Data, results of analysis (2019)

For the aspect of public knowledge of the decision-making and control over policy based on Arnstein's degree of participation are at a score of 3, which means the reduction of anger/placation. This implies that the advice given by the community is accepted but not always implemented. The assessment score for the control aspect of the policy, according to Arnstein's participation rate, is worth 3, which means the reduction of anger/placation. This implies that for the control of public policy,
there has been reciprocity from the community. The community can have little power and be heard by policymakers.

The analysis using Arnstein's degree of participation showed the overall level of community participation related to local economic development was in index number 9. It was categorized in the level of tokenism/justification so that the community was not offended or felt their existence was not recognized. (table 8). This also stated by Yumi [8] about the importance of participation by stating that ignoring community participation at the planning and decision-making stages of development causes pseudo participation (pseudo participation).

| Level Participation                  | Factor Value | Index | Group        |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|-------|--------------|
| Community Oversight                 | 4 4 4       | 12    | Community    |
| Delegation of Power                 | 4 3-4 3     | 10-11 | Authority Level |
| Partnership                         | 4 3 2-3     | 9-10  |              |
| Anger Reduction                     | 4 2-3 2-3   | 8-9   | Tokenism level |
| Consultation                        | 3-4 2 2     | 7-8   |              |
| Submit information                  | 2-3 1-2 1-2 | 7-8   |              |
| Therapy                             | 2 1 1       | 4     | Non-         |
| Manipulation                        | 1 1 1       | 3     | Participation|

Source: Primary data, processed products (2019)

4. Conclusions
The results showed that the level of community participation for the communication aspect was at the consultation level, while for the public knowledge aspect of the decision-making forum and the control aspect of public policy was at the level of anger reduction/placation. Overall, the level of community participation in the development of the local economy in Makalu village according to the Arnstein participation ladder is at the level of tokenism / just a justification, so that the community is not offended or feels unrecognized.
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